DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 001 TE 002 816

AUTHOR Brandes, Paul D.
TITLE The Effect of Role Playing by the Culturally Disadvantaged on Attitudes toward Bidialectalism. Final Report.
INSTITUTION North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-9-C-057
PUB DATE Nov 71
GRANT OEG-3-70-002(010)
NOTE 82p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Changing Attitudes; *Culturally Disadvantaged; English Instruction; Instructional Program Divisions; Measurement Instruments; Motivation Techniques; *Negroes; *Nonstandard Dialects; *Role Playing; Self Concept; Sex Differences; Standards; Tests

ABSTRACT

In an effort to motivate culturally different students to learn standard English while they remain proud of their dialect and retain it as their informal manner of speaking, 120 blacks at three grade levels role played from scripts the parts of employers, college admissions officers, and applicants. The scripts rewarded applicants who could and were proud of speaking two dialects, and penalized applicants who could speak only one dialect, even if that dialect was standard English. A control group of 120 blacks completed Ss for two three-dimensional designs, one featuring sex, grade level and role playing, the second featuring achievement, grade level and role playing. Criterion measures were (1) a semantic differential designed by this study to measure the attitudes of blacks toward bidialectalism, and (2) a series of Likert-like items testing a variety of attitudes. The semantic differential was partially successful in measuring the attitudes of blacks toward bidialectalism but needs further refinement. Blacks were favorable toward bidialectals, and role playing could motivate them to be even more favorable. Sex, achievement, and grade level were not consistent factors in influencing results, although there were indications that achievers responded more favorably than non-achievers. (Author)

BR 9-C-057

IE-NCERD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 060001

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 9-C-057
Grant No. OEG-3-70-008(010)

Paul D. Brandes
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina
27514

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TE
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. UD

THE EFFECT OF ROLE PLAYING BY THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED ON ATTITUDES TOWARD BIDIALECTALISM

November, 1970

for a grant made jointly to:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

TE 002 816

ABSTRACT

In an effort to motivate culturally different students to learn standard English while they remain proud of their dialect and retain it as their informal manner of speaking, 120 blacks at three grade levels role played from scripts the parts of employers, college admissions officers, and applicants. The scripts rewarded applicants who could and were proud of speaking two dialects, and penalized applicants who could speak only one dialect, even if that dialect was standard English.

A control group of 120 blacks completed Ss for two three-dimensional designs, one featuring sex, grade level and role playing, the second featuring achievement, grade level and role playing. Criterion measures were (1) a semantic differential designed by this study to measure the attitudes of blacks toward bidialectalism and (2) a series of Likert-like items testing a variety of attitudes.

The semantic differential was partially successful in measuring the attitudes of blacks toward bidialectalism but needs further refinement. Blacks were favorable toward bidialectals, and role playing could motivate them to be even more favorable. Sex, achievement, and grade level were not consistent factors in influencing results, although there were indications that achievers responded more favorably than non-achievers.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH. EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Report

Project No. 9-C-057

Grant No. OEG-3-70-002(010)

THE EFFECT OF ROLE PLAYING BY THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED ON ATTITUDES TOWARD BIDIALECTALISM

Paul D. Brandes

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

The Research herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

National Center for Educational Research and Development

TE 002 816

PREFACE

The researchers wish to offer their appreciation to Professors Bert E. Bradley of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Theodore Clevenger of Florida State University, Kenneth Frandsen of The Pennsylvania State University, and Ray Smith of Indiana University for their assistance in the development of the semantic differential.

They are indebted to the directors of the Upward Bound Program at the North Carolina Agricultural and Technical University at Greensboro and to the directors of Operation Breakthrough in Durham, North Carolina, for their assistance in furnishing subjects to suggest paired adjectives for the semantic differential and to clarify the dialect in the scripts.

The following public school personnel were helpful in securing subjects for the experiment, and the researchers are pleased to be able to thank them for their cooperation:

at Goldsboro, North Carolina: Mr. Sam H. Shugart, Principal: Mr. David Green, Associate Principal; Mrs. Hilda D. Sutton, Director of Instruction; Mrs. Margaret D. Grady, Counselor; Mrs. Juanita Lewis, Instructor of English; Miss Mary Smith, Instructor of Social Studies; Miss Betty L. Davis, Instructor of English; and Mrs. M. L. Hoskins, Instructor of Speech.

at Durham, North Carolina: Mrs. Adele B. Butts, Counselor at Carr Junior High School; Mrs. Nancy Rowland, Counselor at Durham Senior High School, and Mr. Robert Lawrence, Counselor at Hillside High School.

at Pittsboro, North Carolina: Mr. Alton Campbell, Principal, Northwood High School; Mr. I. E. Taylor, Principal, Horton Middle School; Mrs. Annie W. May, Counselor, Horton Middle School; Mrs. Bertha J. Eckols, Counselor, Northwood High School; Mrs. Marilyn W. Harrell, Teacher of English; Mrs. L. W. Heritage, Teacher of English; Mr. Ronald S. Alligood, Teacher of English.

at Hertford County, North Carolina: Mr. J. M. Jenkins, Associate Superintendent of Schools; Mr. Marion Bird, Principal, Murphreesboro High School; Mr. R. E. Gadsden, Assistant Principal, Murphreesboro High School; Mr. Eley Newsome, Principal, Ahoskie High School; Mr. Clarence Newsome, Assistant Principal, Ahoskie High School; Mrs. Garnette B. Hughes, Guidance Counselor, Ahoskie High School; Mrs. Dorothy Wilder, Instructor of English; Miss Linda R. Holmes, Instructor of English; Mrs. Lois Brett, Instructor of English; Mrs. T. H. Hall, Instructor of English; and Mrs. Queen Varner, Instructor of English.

at Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Duane O. Moore, Assistant Superintendent; Mrs. Zora Rashkis, Instructor of English; Mr. Phillip Oppenheimer, Instructor of English; Mrs. Euzelle P. Smith, Guidance Counselor; and Mrs. Patricia Stanford, Guidance Counselor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract..page 2

Title page..page 3

Preface...page 4

Table of contents...page 5

Body of the report

Introduction..page 6
Development of the criterion measures.................page 8
Development of the role playing scripts...............page 12
Sampling and administration of the variables.......page 19
Processing of the data................................page 21
Interpretation of results
PART ONE: The Semantic Differential
A. involving sex differences.............page 24
B. involving achievement differences.....page 30
PART TWO: The Likert Items
A. involving sex differences.............page 32
B. involving achievement differences.....page 38
Conclusions
significant findings.........................page 44
limitations..................................page 47
implications for further study................page 48

Bibliography..page 50

Appendixes

Appendix One: computer print-out on 80 Ss used to establish the semantic differential
Appendix Two: table of correlations on 80 Ss used to establish the semantic differential
Appendix Three: first draft of the semantic differential
Appendix Four: second draft of the semantic differential
Appendix Five: computer print-out showing factor analysis
Appendix Six: first draft of role playing scripts
Appendix Seven: second draft of role playing scripts

INTRODUCTION

Teachers have always had a difficult time in motivating their students to learn "standard" English. This difficulty appears to have increased with the integration of the public schools. Students who formerly attended a "prestige" school may find that their "prestige" English does not always function with the effectiveness that it had seemed to generate before; students who formerly attended ghetto schools may find that their ghetto English does not always function with the effectiveness that it had seemed to generate before; teachers from both "prestige" schools and ghetto schools may find that, whereas before, they "knew their subject matter" and "knew how ti teach it," they are now disturbed by a dialect clash that they do not altogether understand.

In working in the field with teachers in several parts of the state and in conducting seminars on campuses and at conventions where teachers were in attendance and where the sibs of new teachers were able to provide feedback from the field, the experimenters found that teachers were searching more diligently than ever before for means of motivating their students to learn. In the area of language arts, the experimenters found that the teachers were not opposed to trying new concepts in the classroom, provided that parents and adminstrators would permit, but they were in such despair over the lack of results of their former instructional methods that they were not highly optimistic about the ability of new methods to achieve success.

Therefore, having been convinced that, of the various solutions which were available to the teacher of English to solve the dialect clash, the bidialectal solutions was the most workable, the experimenters began to investigate ways in which teachers could motivate their students to increase their desire to learn a "standard" English while, at the same time, the teachers could motivate students to explore the richness of their own dialects and to be proud of being able to speak them. Several avenues of approach were available: teams of visitors could have appeared before the students, demonstrating the need of both dialects in the work that the students would be doing after having been graduated; the state-adopted literature books could have been supplemented with readings in dialect, carefully chosen and even composed to forward the ideas of bidialectalism; English-as-a-foreign-language teachniques could have been used which, being new to the student, might have motivated him to improve his learning motivation. Work needs to be done in all three of these areas, but the experimenters chose to attempt motivation through role playing (a) because role playing had proved effective in other fields and (b) because role playing could be attempted in the school systems without unnecessarily disturbing the tenuous atmosphere which was prevading the school systems in North Carolina.

The State of North Carolina features people who speak many different white and many different black dialects. The experimenters would have liked to have liked to have worked with all dialects. However, it was necessary to limit the initial project to an amount of work which could be accomplished with the funds available. Therefore, the experimenters elected to try out their role playing on black subjects. They knew that just as much attention needs to be given to motivating whites to become bidialectal, and they intend to pursue such investigations in the future.

Once the decisions had been made to limit the study to motivating black students to want to become bidialectal through role playing, several other decisions were necessary and they were reached as follows:

1. the experimenters accepted what they considered to be a myth that "standard" English as a dialect was operating in the areas where the testing was to occur. They concluded that, although this "standard" might change considerably from locality to locality, it was identifiable to the people in that locality, even though many or even most of the people in that speech community did not speak the "standard" English which they could identify. Therefore the term "standard" English was accepted pragmatically, and, with this understanding, the experimenters will not always put quotation marks around it in their ensuing discussion.

2. the experimenters decied to make no distinction between the words "dialect" and "language", proposing that it was only the socio-economic prestige of the latter which made speaking a "language" more prestigious than speaking a "dialect". Therefore, Black English was to be considered as a language with systematic differences from "standard" English, and White Appalachian was to be considered as a language with systematic differences from Black English, and so forth.

3. the experimenters elected to use role playing scripts rather than free role playing, because their work in the field had convinced them that, although a few students were very excellent at switching dialects, the majority of both white and black subjects were not in sufficient control of their dialects to improvise the dialectal differences needed for the experiment.

After these five decisions had been reached, the experimenters developed a plan of action which included the following steps:

a. developing a semantic differential to measure attitudes of blacks toward bidialectalism and redesigning a series of Likert items which had previously been used in the field to measure opinion shifts

b. selecting a sample which would represent typical English students in three levels of the North Carolina public schools: 9th&10th graders; 11th&12th graders and college freshmen.

c. administering to this sample the role playing scripts which had been devised followed by the administration of the two criterion measures

d. analyzing the results

The experimenters were aware, as experimenters should be, that they had certain expectations which they hoped that the study would produce. This is evident in the discussion where the experimenters speak of subjects moving in the predicted direction or in a favorable direction. However, the experimenters were careful not to let their aspirations for the study interfer with its results. They understood their obligations as experimenters, and were perhaps unnecessarily careful to protect bias from entering the study. Therefore they declined to discuss with any subjects or with any teachers the implications of the study past the point which would insure cooperation, explaining that the results would be mailed to each school and that the experimenters would return to explain the results. This and many other steps were taken to protect the results from experimenter bias.

The divisions on the following pages, as outlined in the table of contents, present the study.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CRITERION MEASURES

1. The Semantic Differential

The proposal as approved on August 5, 1969, for funding on September 15, 1969,[1] had recommended as a criterion measure a series of Likert and Woodward type items. However, as a contingency for approving the project, John A. Morrow, then Director of Educational Research for Region III, requested by telephone that several adjustments in the project be made, one of which included the use of a more sophisticated measuring device. After consulting with Professor Grant Dahlstrom of the Department of Psychology of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the investigators proposed to Mr. Morrow that a semantic differential be added to the criterion measures previously submitted, and Mr. Morrow approved this amendment.

The inclusion of this second criterion measure actually turned one proposal into two proposals: first, the investigators had to design a semantic differential which would measure the attitudes of blacks toward bidialectalism; second, they had to apply this measure to the requisite number of subjects specified in the proposal. However, this additional task was welcomed with enthusiasm since it would make the project that more useful.

Instead of using an existing semantic differential which might have been or which might not have been meaningful to the subjects to which it was to be applied, and which might or might not have been sensitive to the particular problems of bidialectalism being investigated by this study, the experimenters elected to develop a list of polar adjectives (a) which would be furnished by subjects similar to those used in the study and (b) which would apply specifically to attitudes toward bidialectalism. In order to secur this list of specialized adjectives, contact was made with Operation Breakthrough in Durham, N.C., and, on August 13, 1970, Mr. Alton Kirk made available to the investigators twenty-five black high school and rising college freshmen. These subjects were divided into three small groups, meeting for forty-five minutes each consecutively in a seminar room at North Carolina Central University in Durham, North Carolina. Present at the informal sessions were the director of Operation Breakthrough and his assistant; the chief investigator; Mrs. Edna Mills, Assistant Professor of English at North Carolina Central University;[2] and seven to nine of the subjects per session. These small groups were encouraged to suggest adjectives which they felt described favorably and unfavorably a black who could speak both his home dialect and also had control over a "standard" English dialect.

The three sessions with the Operation Breakthrough subjects could best be described by the oxymoron, stormy-cooperative. The overt hostility of some of the subjects assured the investigators that a good cross-section of black youth had been selected by Mr. Kirk. Some of the subjects who appeared most hostile at the beginning of the exercise concluded the sessions by furnishing the longest and more relevant list of adjectives. Subjects were not surprised by being asked to describe a bidialectal person, and they appeared to be frank in their answers. Every effort was made not to lead the subjects by suggesting adjectives for their approval or disapproval. Adjectives elicited in one session were not suggested to subjects in a subsequent session until after the second set of subjects had seemingly exhausted their unique contributions to the list. Not all of the adjectives suggested had pairs, e.g., the adjective "bull-headed" was suggested to describe a black who refused to be bidialectal, but no anonym was forthcoming from the sessions. The total list of adjectives suggested by the Operation Breakthrough students exceeded fifty.

---

[1] The proposal was actually signed by Frederick A. Will, Regional Contracting Officer, on October 24, 1969, and by A. H. Shepard, Assistant Vice-President and Treasurer of the University of North Carolina on November 4, 1969.

[2] During the summer session of 1970, Mrs. Mills was enrolled in a special projects course at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and was very helpful in securing the cooperation of Operation Breakthrough and in assisting in the development of the adjectives on the semantic differential.

After consulting dictionaries of synonyms and anonyms, after discussing the suggestions of the subjects with selected blacks and whites, and after weighing the merits of including terms somewhat unique to black dialect as well as other terms which were more akin to "standard" English, the following list of twenty paired adjectives was developed and randomly ordered both as to sequence and as to polarity:[3]

relaxed.......tense
together.......tired
unsociable.......sociable
extrovert.......introvert
uneasy.......easy
bull-headed.......elastic
self-centered.......unselfish
strung-out.......cool
hep.......square
unlimited.......limited
recessive.......dominant
loner.......mixer
bold.......cautious
ambitious for himself.......ambitious for others
outgoing.......withdrawn
open-minded.......closed-minded
adaptable.......rigid
comfortable.......out-of-place
uncertain.......confident
not with it.......with it

Through the cooperation of Professor Norman Johnson, Chairman of the Department of Education at North Carolina Central University, and his assistant, Professor George E. Clark, eighty subjects were administered a role playing exercise which had been developed earlier and which will be described below. Following the role playing exercise, these subjects were administered the twenty-item semantic differential described above.

Twenty-four of the subjects were junior high school students from the ninth grade of Carr Junior High School in Durham; forty were students at Hillside High School in Durham, 17 of which were sophomores and 23 of which were juniors and seniors: and sixteen were college freshmen at North Carolina Central University. The scores of these eighty subjects were fed through the IBM 360-75 Triangle University Computer using a factor analysis program generated for the University of California at Los Angeles Bio-Medical Department (BMD) entitled BMD03M. Based upon these eighty scores of black subjects completing the semantic differential after role playing in groups of four exclusively black subjects, the following list of fifteen adjectives was chosen for inclusion on the semantic differential, and again the adjectives were randomly arranged according to sequence and according to negative-positive attributes:[4]

---

[3] First, the pairs were ordered by a table of random numbers, and then a table of random numbers was used to randomly order the polarity by assigning a "1" to that part of the pair which had been termed "favorable" and a "2" to that part of the pair which had been termed "unfavorable".

open-minded.......closed-minded[5]
tired.......energetic[6]
comfortable.......uncomfortable
uncertain.......confident
strung-out.......cool
unlimited.......limited
sociable.......unsociable
withdrawn.......outgoing
square.......hip (hep)[7]
ambitious for others.......ambitious for himself
easy.......uneasy
relaxed.......tense
follower.......leader[8]
cautious.......bold
"with it"......."not with it"

It was this semantic differential of fifteen paired adjectives which was administered to the subjects whose scores are reported for the role playing project.

---

[4] The scores of an additional 28 black high school subjects were also available, but because a cooperating guidance counselor lost the data which would have permitted the investigators to know whether or not all of these subjects role played in exclusively black groups, the computer run of the 80 blacks who had role played in exclusively black groups was used to selected the fifteen adjectives rather than the computer run of 108 blacks, 28 of which may or may not have role played in exclusively black groups. The results of the computer run on the 80 subjects together with its correlations are given in Appendix One and Appendix Two.

[5] The pair of adjectives, simple-complex, was listed initially to assist subjects in relating the directions to the exercise, but this pair was not considered in the calculations.

[6] The original differential had included two pairs: together-tired & introvert-extrovert. However, after a "rap" session with blacks at Carr Junior High School, it was determined that a sufficient number of students did not understand the terms "introvert-extrovert" and that "together" was more comprehensible in the Black English of older subjects than it was in the Black English of younger subjects. Therefore, the pair tired-energetic was substituted which the junior high students agreed was comprehensible to them.

[7] At the same "rap" session at Carr Junior High School, it was determined that, because of the manner in which Southern whites and blacks use [I] where [ε] is often used in "standard" English, subjects would be more likely to recognize "hep" if it were spelled "hip".

[8] The original pair of adjectives here had been passive-aggressive, but again the junior high subjects had trouble comprehending these terms. Therefore, upon the suggestion of these subjects, the pair follower-leader was substituted.

By the time that the results of the role playing exercise had been completed and were ready to be fed through the computer, a new factor analysis program from the Biomedical Program of the University of Southern California at Los Angeles was available called BMDX72. It had been developed because certain malfunctions had been noted in BMD03M. Therefore, interpreted scores were fed into the new program with some difference noted.[9] As a result of this second run, the following paired adjectives were those used to evaluate the following factors:[10]

SOCIAL CHARACTER	APPARENT CHARACTER	PERSONALITY VALUE
comfortable-uncomfortable	cool-strung-out	ambitious ambitious for others-for himself
sociable-unsociable	hep-square	
relaxed-tense	"with it"-"not with it"	easy-uneasy
		leader-follower

Rather than using a mean of the three scores under each favor, the experimenters elected to use the median score on the assumption that the median would reflect more nearly the attitude of the subject toward the factor by eliminating any extremes which could be attributed to individual reactions to a given word or which could be attributed to failure to comprehend the significance of a given word. Therefore, if, under SOCIAL CHARACTER, the scores of the subject were "1", "1" and "7", the score "1" was used; if, under APPARENT CHARACTER, the scores of the subject were "1", "2", and "4", the score "2" was used.

The final run using the new computer program is recorded in Appendix Five, and the original form of the differential and its revised form are noted in Appendixes Three and Four.

---

[9] On the first run, on the factor which had been termed APPARENT CHARACTER, the pair of adjectives elastic-bull-headed had loaded slightly less than did the five pairs of adjectives which were included on the revised semantic differential to measure this particular factor. But, on the second run, this pair of adjectives was second to the highest in its loading value, exceeded only by the pair, hap-dquare, whereas the pair open-minded-closed-minded, which had loaded most heavily on the first run, loaded only moderately on the second run, with more tendency to split than had been noted on the first run.

[10] In keeping with Osgood's philosophy, an equal number of adjectives was included for each factor measured. Therefore, although five pairs of adjectives loaded very satisfactorily for the factor APPARENT CHARACTER on the revised run [cool, hep, outgoing, open-minded, and "with-it"], and although four pairs of adjectives loaded satisfactorily for the factor SOCIAL CHARACTER on the revised run [relaxed, sociable, unlimited, and dominant], only three pairs of adjectives loaded satisfactorily for the factor PERSONALITY VALUE on the revised program run [ambitious for others, easy, and extrovert, the last of which had been converted, along with dominant-recessive into the pair of adjectives called leader-follower] of those adjectives which had been selected for testing purposes. The results of the second run resulted in diminishing the number of paired adjectes to be used for each factor from five to three. If the BMDX72 program had been available earlier, its results would u ndoubtedly have modified the selection of the adjective pairs to be retained for the experiment, e.g., selfish-unselfish would have been retained whereas open-minded-closed-minded would have been eliminated.

2. The Likert Scales

In addition to the semantic differential, the experimenters used a second criterion measure composed of six Likert scales. These six scales had been used in a previous experiment concerning the reorientation of selected teachers in Hertford County, North Carolina, and had been designed to explore areas of questioning which had been put to the experimenters during their experiences in Hertford County. The items were so chosen and arranged that the following avenues of interest could be explored:

> a. a consistent scorere would have to makr to the left of the scale to answer one question and to the right of the scale to answer a second question, both scales purporting to test the same opinion.
>
> b. inconsistent scorers might well reflect the ambilance of opinion concerning Black English and "standard" English which had been perceived in previous subjective experiences of the experimenters.

These six Likert items were preceded by three items which were inserted to obtain some additional data from the subjects, but which were present largely to restore the confidence of the subjects in their ability to complete a second page of testing. It had been observed that the semantic differential had proved sufficiently complex to a number of subjects that some means of restoring confidence was needed among certain subjects, particularly among the non-achievers, if additional data was to be obtained. Even then a number of junior high and senior high subjects became so discouraged aftter their inability to understand the first page of testing that they omitted filling out the second page entirely. It was only after prompting by the experimenters that this defeatist attitude did not become a major factor in undermining the results of the experiment.

The administration of the Likert scales followed the administration of the semantic differential in order that the more obvious nature of the Likert items would not prejudice the results of the more covert semantic differential.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROLE PLAYING SCRIPTS

An initial decision had been made that subjects would not be able to manipulate their dialects sufficiently to make free role-playing possible. Therefore, after conferring with Professor John Schopler of the Psychology Department of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, it was decided to use controlled role playing based upon scripts.

Once this initial decision had been made, a second decision had to be reached. The project had been designed when the vast majority of the school systems in the State of North Carolina were completely segregated, and its approval had been secured just as the publish schools in North Carolina were entering upon an intensive desegregation program. These developments furnished two problems for the investigators which had not been foreseen at the time that the proposal had been drafted: (1) the school systems were much concerned (perhaps overly concerned) that no incident occur during the period that the schools were undergoing their integration initiation and were deservedly, although possibly overly, hesitant about exposing their students to any experimental treatment involving attitudes toward dialects where the reaction of subjects was unpredictable and perhaps volatile; and (2) the investigators could not request a school to furnish exsluviely black subjects, but had to accept indiscriminately both white and black subjects. Since it had been deemed desirable that, initially, subjects who role played in exclusively white groups, in exclusively black groups, and in mixed black and white groups, should be considered separately until some evidence was available to indicate that the composition of the group did not affect the results, and since this project was limited to reporting on the effects upon black subjects, it was necessary to accept many more subjects than had been originally anticipated. When subjects had to be divided into groups of four for the role playing exercise, considerable care had to be exercised during the intial stages of the experiment to prevent any detection of the racial manipulation which resulted in as many groups of four black subjects together as could be managed. It soon became apparent that the subjects themselves were not so much concerned about possible manipulation as were the school administrators and the experimenters. Therefore, as the experiment progressed, less covert methods were used in attempts to group students, but there was no relaxation of the care exercised to prevent any racial disturbances based upon the experiment.[11]

One of the chief reasons why the subjects did not exhibit negative attitudes toward the experiment was the manner in which they were approached. In every instance possible, both a black supervisor and a white supervisor were plainly involved in the administration of the exercise. The joint sponsorship of the project by a school whose enrollment is predominantly black and by a school whose enrollment is predominantly white was also helpful. Furthermore, in the beginning, before it had been determined that subjects would generally respond in a very favorable manner toward the exercise, teams of black and white collect students accompanied the investigators, assisted in the exercise, and made it plain to the subjects that they were concerned about the results of the role playing. These precautionary measures were taken to insure cooperating administraotrs and to reassure the experimenters that, during the early stages of integration in the schools of North Carolina, no incident would occur which would make a continuation of the project inadvisable. The experimenters were pleased to discover that, with the few exceptions of those students who appeared to be totally apathetic to any type of school activity, the reaction of the subjects was one of interest and enthusiasm. The monitoring of the exercises by integrated teams of college students was found to be unnecessary and was discontinued. However, the experimenters who administered the treatments and the criterion measures were continually on the alert for any attitudes which might reflect unfavorably upon the even tenor of the school or upon the reliability of the experiment.

---

[11] It is not possible here to describe the various means which the experimenters used to secure a measure of racially homogeneous groups during the development of the semantic differential, and, to some extent, during the administration of the role playing exercise itself, because each situation was different and had to be handled adriotly without much warning as to what would be the atmosphere encountered. It is possible to say, however, that at no time did any subject, any teacher or any administrator raise the question as to whether the manner in which the exercise had manipulated subjects was injurious to the subjects or to the school system.

A thorough search of the literature did not reveal previous studies which had used role playing in an attempt to modify attitudes toward bidialectalism, so the researchers pioneered in the development of their scripts. They knew that the dialects in the scripts would have to be accepted as accurate by the subjects. Therefore scripts written in "standard" English were fed to a group of volunteers from the Upward Bound Program at the North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University during the summer of 1970. Volunteers were asked to feed back to the experimenters the equivalent of the "standard" English in Black English. Although the summer of 1970 was one of the peak periods of "black nationalism" in North Carolina with blacks adopting African hair style, African dress, and employing slogans and lines of reasoning which would develop black pride, their modified habits in these respects did not seem to extend to language. During these interviews in which the "standard" English was translated into Black English, most blacks were a little amused, usually helpful, sometimes hostile, and occasionally puzzled in their efforts to determine what would be an equivalent usage in Black English to the "standard" English used as the stimulus.[12] Those members of Upward Bound who were amused and cooperative usually did not openly conflict with the minority of the Upward Bound students who were hostile. A typically hostile comment was: "Well, you can be getting what you want from all this stuff, but blacks don't talk like that anymore." However, the manner in which these protests were vocalized often included those syntactical, phonological, lexical and kinetic features which make Black English unique, many of which were being incorporated into the scripts. While waiting in the dormitory lounges or in the classrooms to have the Upward Bound students assemble for the discussions, many of the same usages which were eventually incorporated in the Black English used in the scripts were heard in the casual speech of the blacks conducting their normal affairs. This hostile reaction to any pride in their own Black English among blacks raises important questions which are not dealt with in this study but which deserve further consideration: (1) what mirror effect is there in dialect which causes people to translate internally their informal English into a formal English; (2) what is the attitude of minority groups in the United States toward the national characteristics of their language; and (3) if this attitude is found to be negative, why is this negative attitude at variance with favorable attitudes toward divergent habits among blacks in reference to theirdress, apeance, diet, and other aspects of their culture.

White dialects of rural North Carolina were sufficiently familiar to the researchers and sufficiently documented on tape recordings made by students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill enrolled in seminars in social dialects, that the limited use of white dialects in the scripts was not subject to the same type of feedback exercises as had been done with the Black English used in the scripts.

---

[12] An instance wherein the black subjects were puzzled in their efforts at translation involved an attempt to find a Black English equivalent for the phrase "cleaning woman". Since none was forthcoming, the script was rewritten to avoid the impasse. "Custodian," "janitor," "maid," "girl," "the girl who cleans up," and other terms were discarded as unacceptable. The dialect version of the script ended up saying: "I start wurkin' in de dime store pushin' uh broom when I was fo-teen years old, ater school."

The researchers made an initial error in the development of their scripts. They began with the assumption that minority groups were tied of being told that "you people" (meaning the minority group" speak a dialect whereas other people in the community who compose the majority speak "standard" English. Therefore the researchers thought that it would be best to have all persons involved in the interviews to exhibit their normal dialectal characteristics and so they produced the script shown in Appendix Six. Since the authority figures in the scripts would presumably represent white people, although any conclusions drawn by subjects in this regard would be from indirect rather than from direct evidence, it was felt that the normal characteristics of the speech of a white employers or of a white college admissions administrator in the State of North Carolina should be honored, e.g., "trying" for "trying", "yer" for "your,", and "yer father zuh preacher" for "your father is a preacher." However, when these scripts were piloted, the reaction of the Ss was surprisingly hostile toward persons in authority who did not use "correct" English. Typical of the comments which were offered by the subjects on the backs of their papers were:

> When you work in office's [sic] a secretary about all [sic](above all) should know how to talk and answer people, so should a doctor. It was to know and realize the between the dialects people speak.
>
> I think that this script is very hard to read but its [sic] the way some blacks and white [sic] talk but I really didn't like it at all. It was very difficult to read.
>
> I thought the language was pretty bad for the doctor and the college student to speak.
>
> I thought that this role playing investigation was very stupid in a way and interesting an [sic] other way [sic]. It was stupid in a way because very seldom to [sic] you hear anybody using this kind [of] dialect. People might use verbs in the wrong places but very seldom [do] they go this far by spelling the way it sound [sic]. It was interesting because I enjoyed trying to talk another dialect.
>
> I thought that the while thing was no good because people living in Durham . . . well, I'd like to change that the people around here never uses [sic] that kind of language, unless they are playing around. But I did like reading it. I also feel that a person should us [sic] correct English at all times.
>
> We are sent to school to learn the right English but the play was in wrong English.
>
> The Dialect [sic] was very poor and the persons speaking weren't together in speech. The speech was sort of a Negro dialect and was very harsh.

The experimenters therefore found that subjects were marking the semantic differential with some interference. It could not be determined the extent to which they were registering their reaction to a bidialectal peer and the extent to which they were registering their negative reaction to persons in authority who exhibited the normal dialectal characteristics of the region. Therefore, the scripts had to be revised in the following manner: (a) all spellings, syntax, and vocabulary for authority figures were retransposed back into "standard" English except that excuses were found whereby authority figures could pointedly use dialect in the course of the interview under circumstances where it was obvious that the authority figure was aware of when he was speaking a dialect and when he was speaking "standard" English; (b) one script was arranged to contain a peer-group figure plainly labeled "white" who would be using a dialect in the manner which the subjects had objected to previously, making certain that, even though the purpose of the experiment was to encourage tolerance for all minority dialects, any hostility of blacks toward blacks speaking black dialect in the scripts would be accompanied first by an acknowledgement that whites speaking dialects as well; (c) since researchers were confined to a time unit of approximately forty minutes in which directions had to be given, role players had to be assembled and the role playing performed, and directions for the semantic differential had to be administered orally, following which subjects had to complete the differential plus the likert items, unless only one script was to be used, it was impossible for all subjects to play the parts of all parties in all scripts. It did not seem possible to work into one script the various situations which the experimenters had in mind, e.g., a white penalized for being able to speak only informal speech[13]; a black penalized for being able to speak only formal speech; a black rewarded for demonstrating that he could speak both formal and informal speech; and a black rewarded for being able to speak formal speech but who exhibited attitudes that he could speak informally and was proud of being able to do so. After considering all of the possibilities involved, it seemed to the experimenters that they could order four scripts bearing these four characteristics in such a manner as would effectively support bidialectalism without arousing the hostility of the subjects.[14]

A decision was made to "pair" the scripts, i.e., the first two scripts were to be concerned with college admission and the second two scripts were to be concerned with job application. The dialoque in the paired scripts would be very much the same, with the exception of the changes necessitated to exhibit the personalities of the several interviewees involved. It was hoped that this "pairing" would achieve the following:

---

[13] The applicant in Script One said: "I spend uh lotta time on thuh paper, hits interestin', but I also run on the track team. I'm a long distance runner. Us whites do good runnin' long distances. Our team's great. Got good sprinters too."

[14] There were, of course, endless possibilities for the attitudes which could be exhibited in the scripts and the types of persons who expressed these attitudes. At this point, the choice of the four possibilities outlined here was purely subjective, and the researchers are interested in developing scripts with other viewpoints.

1. It would emphasize how one dialect may be acceptable under certain surroundings whereas a second dialect may be equally acceptable under other surroundings, e.g., "standard" English would be acceptable in one instance and dialectal English acceptable in another instance. Therefore, in Script One, the interviewee said:

> Mr. Featherton hepped me. He said you'all got thuh bes' chem department in thishere[15] area, an' I know you'all got some real fine teachers.

In the Second Script, the interviewee said:

> Mr. Featherson said you had the best chemistry department in this area, and I know you have some fine teachers.

2. It would allow authority figures to react to two people applying for the same post, the predominant variation provoking a difference in the reaction of the authority figures being the dialect which the applicants spoke. Therefore, in Scripts One and Two, authority figures were able to penalize an applicant for using informal English in a situation where formal English is often required and to reward an applicant for using formal English in a situation where formal English is required; in Scripts Three and Four, the authority figures were able to reward an applicant for being able to use informal English in a situation where informal English was required and to penalize the applicant for using formal English in a situation where informal English was required.

3. It would permit two sets of comparisons: in the first pair of scripts, it would permit a unidialectal white person to be compared unfavorably with a bidialectal black person, whereas, in the second pair of scripts, it would permit a bidialectal black to be compared favorably in contrast to a unidialectal applicant, this applicant being almost unmistakably black, although the label was never directly applied.

8 4. It would permit two foci, making the subjects of the scripts relevant both to those who had aspirations to college and also to those who want to proceed from high school to seek a job.

The order in which the scripts was to appear gave considerable concern. As has been pointed out previously, more whites serves as subjects than blacks, even though this project limits itself to reporting on black subjects. But it was felt that whites had more resistance to being "put down" for their dialect than did blacks, because the whites had a larger socioeconomic prestige cushion to absorb their fall and they had probably been told less frequently that they spoke an inferior language than did the blacks. Therefore, Script One featured the typical "red neck" who labeled himself as white and who had not learned to adapt his speech to the occasion. The researchers had misgivings about establishing a "set" through this script in which informal dialects were looked upon unfavorably, so they compensated by having the authority figures say plainly at the conclusion of the script that they respected dialects, that they themselves spoke a dialect when they wishes. One of the authority figures pointedly used a dialect similar to that used by the white applicant who applied, but the authority figure regretted that the applicant could not adapt his speech to the occasion and use formal English when formal English was appropriate.

---

[15] A random monitoring of the subjects as they role played showed that they were not able to achieve the pronunciation [ðɪʃiɚ] by the spelling "thishere". Perhaps the phonetic spelling "thihSHRER" would have been better.

The second script featured a black who had excellent command of standard English in order to reassure subjects that the experimenters believed that blacks could achieve a command of standard English equal to that of whites, but this black let it be known (a) that he could speak a dialect and (b) that he was proud of being able to speak a dialect.

It was then possible for Script Three to introduce a black who could and did speak Black English. The experience of the investigators was that, although many blacks speak Black English, they resent seeing Black English in print. Therefore, by introducing the Black English in print as late as the third script and rewarding its usage, the experimenters hoped to avoid the negative reaction of blacks to seeing Black English in print, a reaction which they had witnessed in the past.

Scropt Four was then able to feature a black [covertly labeled] who was so "up-tight" that he would not speak a dialect. It was hoped that the unfavorable attitude of many blacks toward "oreos"[16] would assist in motivating blacks to want to keep their own dialect while at the same time they learned "standard" English.

After the decisions had been made (a) to present more than one script, (b) to order them in a particular way, and (c) to conform to the time exegencies by having a given subject take only one part in each of the four scripts, it was necessary to increase the number of persons in each script to four, two of which would be authority figures and two of which would be dependent figures. Furthermore, each member of a group of four role players would be assigned a number, and that member would read the character in each script which had been assigned his number. Therefore, in the course of reading the four scripts, a given role player might proceed from playing the part of an authority figure in the first script to playing the part of a dependent figure in the second script to playing an authority figure in the third script to eventually playing a dependent figure in the fourth script. Each role player would therefore be certain to take the role of two superior and two inferior persons.

The two superior roles were achieved by presenting a team of two interviewers for job placement and for college admission, and the two inferior roles were achieved by having both an applicant and a secretary in each script. The role of the secretary proved very useful in providing a devil's advocate who could accuse the authority figures of bigotry when they appeared to penalize an applicant for his inability to be bidialectal. This gave the authority figures an opportunity to present a point of view which supported any dialect, provided it was offered to a receptive target.

---

[1] The word"oreo" is slang for a black person who is black on the outside but white in the middle, as is the national brand of cookie by the same name.

The researchers were somewhat unhappy with Script Four, for they felt that it would be very unusual for any young applicant, black or white, to speak as stereotyped a "standard" English as the applicant in Script Four ended up using. But, they had learned from their experiences with the first version of the scripts that black students had developed a "set" wherein they and the authority figures around them spoke in a manner which closely resembled the highly formal English that appeared in print in their textbooks. Therefore, the experimenters retained a form of "standard" English which they did not feel represented what any applicant would have spoken under the conditions given.

Sex discrimination in the scripts was to be held to a minimum, but, since the researchers could not be certain in advance what the sex of the person would be who was assigned to play a given role and since they were concerned lest too many options in the scripts might confuse the participants and slow down an exercise which was on a tight schedule, they elected to limit sex option to the role in the scripts assigned to the applying persons. Therefore, at each point where the applicant was addressed by name, an option of "Miss" or "Mister" was provided. In the briefing on the exercise, role players were advised of this option, and the administrators of the exercise circulated around the rooms in which the role playing was taking place, clearing up any isolated cells of confusion about the optional sex role in the scripts and about the rotation of roles from script to script. What little confusion resulted was easily dissipated.

The final version of the script is show in Appendix Seven.

SAMPLING AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE VARIABLES

The experimenters wished to secure a sample which would permit the achievement of three objectives: (a) they wished to draw from a sample of "typical" North Carolina students, i.e., since they wished their results to be applicable in the classrooms throughout the state, they wished to secure a sample which would reflect typical classroom compositions; (b) they wished these "typical" North Carolina students to be drawn from a divergent geographical area in order to avoid any group errors which might be attributable to the atmosphere in any one geographical area; and (c) they wished to avoid any friction by involving the cooperation of too many subjects from any one given school. Therefore, in their requests for cooperation, they asked school officials to furnish them a cross-section of their student bodies, and they elected to draw their sample from small groups living in several sections of the state where blacks represent a sizeable portion of the population.

The desire for divergency proved a sound move tactically, for it soon became apparent that school administrators were reluctant to expose a large sample of their student body to any experiment which might prove disruptive. Furthermore, they were reluctant to move large groups of students, particularly to a central location where trouble could develop. North Carolina public schools are highly overcrowded, and the schools found it very difficult to accommodate large groups of students in any central location.[17]

Therefore, after experiencing numerous difficulties in trying to develop their semantic differential by assembling large numbers of students in one central location, only to find that the possibilities of group errors were such that the data secured had to be discarded, the experimenters elected to administer the role playing exercises in the individual classrooms and to assign without prejudice, some classes to the control group and others to the experimental group. Although this procedure might develop some group errors resulting from a disruptive or atypical condition in a given classroom, the experimenters thought that they could control this possibility of group error much more than they could the somewhat disastrous interruptions which they had experienced during their efforts to develop the semantic differential. Furthermore, administering the role playing exercises in the classrooms themselves had the following advantages:

---

[17] For example, in one school, classrooms were distributed around the auditorium with only an open alcove in between, so that the noise level eminating

first, it placed the exercise in the environment in which it is hoped most teachers would use it and therefore provided a realistic setting for the experiment; second, it provide in the classroom the authority figures of the teachers whose presence aided in a judicious and efficient administration of the experiment[18]; third, it exposed the exercise to the scrutiny of the cooperating teachers whose stimulatinb questions motivated the experimenters to pursue their work with vigor; and fourth, it presented negative responses from administrators who were reluctant o have large groups of students gather in one central location for the administration of an experiment which might prove to be controversial.

In summary, the administration of the experiment in the classroom violated some assumptions of the analysis of variance, but it also avoided massive subject and group errors which would have resulted in more gross errors than the failure to assign subjects at random from one central location to control and experimental groups.[19]

Cooperating schools were as follows:

in the development of the semantic differential
Carr Junior High School, Durham, North Carolina
Durham High School, Durham, North Carolina
Hillside High School, Durham, North Carolina
North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina

in testing the effectiveness of the role playing scripts
Ahoskie High School, Ahoskie, North Carolina
Goldsboro High School-East, Goldsboro, North Carolina
Grey-Culbreth Junior High School, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
Horton Middle School, Pittsboro, North Carolina
Murphreesboro High School, Murphreesboro, North Carolina

(footnote 17 continued from preceding page) from the classrooms surrounding the auditorium made the use of the central meeting place prohibitive; in a second school, the auditorium was in continual use by classes or by extracurricular activities. Even cafeterias are used in such an extended period of shifts that, given time when lunch was being noisily prepared and when cleaning up was going on, cafeterias also proved unsatisfactory for a central meeting place for students. The banging of doors, the entrance and exits of delivery and collection personnel, and the ever-present loudspeaker, when used in concert, often proved too distracting to meet even the minimal demands of experimental conditions. The classroom teacher has sufficiently guarded her classroom so that it proved to be the one oasis where minimal experimental conditions could be met.

[18] Administrators in North Carolina appear to have developed the pattern of turning any exercise of a nature which displaces students from their classrooms into the care of the guidance counselors whose interest in the experiment and whose ability to discipline the students ranged from very effective to very ineffective.

[19] One of the chief subject errors which in turn could have developed into a major group error was the attrition of certain types of students from their classroom positions to the central position. It appeared that the high achievers and the low non-achievers used the passing from one location to another as reasons to absent themselves from testing. The retention of the classroom as the testing place avoided this attrition.

PROCESSING OF THE DATA

Selection of Computer Programs

Computer programs were needed which would perform the following:

a. report the main effects, simple interactions, and triple interactions of the three dimension design

b. break down the intereactions to reveal which combinations of two factors of three factors produced results which were significantly different from other combinations of two factors or three factors

c. break down the main effects then more than two factors were concerned, i.e., to determine for the "C" effect involving junior high, senior high, and college students which level or levels differed significangly from the other levels

After a comprehensive search for computer programs which would produce the results efficiently and with minimal chances for error, the researchers elected to use the two programs below which were available at the Computation Center of the Pennsylvania State University:

1. AN ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE WITH REPEATED MEASURES,[20] contributed by G. Susan Gray and Paul A. Games of the Department of Educational Psychology at Pennsylvania State University, dated March, 1971, and entitled ANOVR. This program, written in Fortran IV, was a revision of an earlier ANOVR program and provided "additional checks on the correctness of data input, particularly on repeated measures." It also contributed Bartlett's test, probability assessments, provisions to expand the labeling of data, and other features which made it a highly usable program.

2. DUNCAN'S MODIFIED (BAYESIAN) LEAST SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE TEST,[21] dated November, 1970, and entitled DLSD. This program, also written in Fortran IV, uses a new statistic for the calculation of all possible comparisons among series of means and is a replacement of an earlier program entitled DMLRT (Duncan's Multiple Range Test). The new program decreases the chance of committing either Type I or Type II errors, and has the advantage of summarizing in a single table the differences in means which are significant.

These programs proved very efficient in providing the necessary output.[22]

---

[20] photo-offset, 18 pp., available through the Computation Center of the Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania.

[21] photo-offset, 7 pp., available through the Computation Center of the Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pennsylvania.

[22] Professor Paul Games of the Department of Educational Psychology at the Pennsylvania State University is in the process of developing an improved program to analyze the analysis of variance with repeated measures. This program was being given its final tests in September of 1971 and should now be perfected. Inquiries should be addressed directly to Professor Games.

When persons consulted in planning the experiment had suggested that one of the interesting things to be determined was whether the role playing might succeed differentially among achievers and non-achievers, their suggestion appeared to be an excellent one, and it was.

However, subsequent events proved that it was very difficult to determine just who, among the black subjects used in the experiment, was an "achiever" and who was a "non-achiever". Here were the problems encountered:

a. first, the experimenters became aware of opinions of linguists whom they respected which indicated that scores on standardized tests written in "standard" English might not indicate the ability of black students to achieve. Although such standardized scores could have been used to determine whether the black subjects used were "achievers" or "non-achievers" according to the particular standardized test used by a given school system, the experimenters felt that this would not be an effective criterion, and so standardized test scores were not used to differentiate achievers from non-achievers.

b. second, the experimenters became aware of the divergency of opinion among guidance counselors in indicating the status of achieving and non-achieving subjects. Some schools were highly optimistic in reporting that almost of their subjects, both white and black, were certainly achievers, an opinion which was not born out by the subjective observations of the experimenters as they spent many hours in the schools which were used in the experiment. Some schools were highly pessimistic in reporting that almost none of their black students were achievers, an opinion which was also not born out by the subjective observations of the experimenters. Therefore, although the experimenters had initially decided to accept the judgments of the guidance counselors concerning the status of achievement, upon receipt of the judgments, they also discarded this means of differentiation among achievers and non-achievers. Some of the reports by the guidance counselors seemed very perceptive, while others were casually reported.

Therefore, somewhat in despair and frankly doubtful that, given the conditions of the North Carolina public school systems at this point in their development of integration that any objective method was available to distinguish achievers from non-achievers,[24] the experimenters returned to the schools and solicited grade point averages for the students tested. This meant that not only would the experimenters have to ask for further consideration from school personnel which had previously extended themselves in behalf of the experimenters, but also meant that material of a very confidental nature would have to be revealed. Negotiations to secure this data were, in all cases, successful, but only after considerable energies had been spent in assuring superintendents, principals, guidance counselors and teachers that the material would be kept highly confidential.

---

[24] In certain of the schools tested, it appeared that persistent efforts were being made to keep "failures" among blacks to a minimum, perhaps for fear of contributing to the unrest which pervaded the school systems. This attributed to a flattening of the grade scores reported by black subjects so that these scores tended to group themselves around a point which could be determined as passing, but which did not commit the school system to reporting these subjects as doing encouraging work. In some systems, the "achieving" blacks would be three or three in number among large numbers of whites, evidently the result of assessing "achieving" as the production of

The analysis of variance program required equal or proportional N's from level to level. Therefore, by using the table of random numbers, in those instances in which the numbers of subjects tested exceeded 20, the number of subjects in each cell was reduced to the 20 subjects per cell stipulated in the proposal.

Certain considerations preceded this random elimination:

1. The semantic differential had appended at the bottom of the page the following question:

> HOW WELL DID YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU HAVE JUST DONE IN MARKING THESE ADJECTIVES TO DESCRIBE A PERSON WHO CAN SPEAK BOTH FORMAL AND INFORMAL ENGLISH?
>
> ( ) understood very well what to do
> ( ) understood well what to do
> ( ) understood somewhat what to do
> ( ) understood a little what to do
> ( ) understood very little what to do

This inquiry had been added at the conclusion of the semantic differential, after the experimenters had seen how puzzled some of the subjects had been during the development of the semantic differential itself. Although the confusion of subjects ranged from among the more perceptive students of all age levels to among the least perceptive at all age levels, it was particularly apparent among junior high students who could be classified as non-achievers. Therefore, with only one exception,[23] subjects who checked that they had understood little or very little of what they had done in registering their scores on the semantic differential were automatically eliminated from the experiment.

2. A limited number of subjects completed the semantic differential successfully or completed the Likert scales successfully, but did not complete both criterion measures successfully. It was necessary for a subject to complete either of the tests completely to be included in the sample, but it was not necessary for him to complete both of the tests in order to be included. In rare instances, the omission of a score was supplied by the experimenters in the form of a neutral response.

3. In an attempt to keep the scores of achievers and non-achievers from the same school relatively the same for both control and experimental groups, some subjects had to be eliminated and others supplied. In every instance possible, when a female subject who, for example, had been a non-achiever had to be replaced with a subject who had been, for example, an achiever, another female subject was inserted. However, because of some limitations in the data available, it is not necessarily true in the design concerned with achievers and non-achievers that an equal number of males and females are involved.

---

[23] One subject whose scores were particularly high and whose checking of the adjectives revealed that he appeared to have understood well what do do was included in the sample, even though he indicated that he understood little of what he had done. His reaction was interpreted to indicate that he did not understand how the semantic differential could reveal atitudes toward bidialectalism, a reaction which had been received often from the more perceptive subjects tested.

It was decided that, among the scores for each school, those in the lower half would be determined as non-achievers, while those in the upper half would be designated as achievers. Needless to say, the experimenters were not satisfied with this decision, and, in spite of their efforts to keep constant the cut-off points for achievers and non-achievers among controls and experimental subjects, they report their second set of data for achievers and non-achievers with considerable reservations.

4. The fourth consideration which preceded the random elimination of surplus scores in those cells which had more than 20 subjects concerned grade level cut offs. North Carolina's recent attempts to match school enrollments with existing school facilities has led to the establishment of a variety of types of graded schools. In some areas, the dividing line between junior high school students and senior high school students has been determined more by what facilities were available than by what would have been the most suitable homogeneous groupings.

The experimenters therefore decided to consider college freshmen as the most advanced group, eleventh and twelfth graders as the middle group, and ninth and tenth graders as the least advanced group. The only exceptions made to this stratification was first, in the instance of some eighth graders[25] from a sophisticated school system, some of which were used as members of the control group for the final role playing process, and second, in the case of some seventh and eighth graders who were used in the development of the semantic differential.

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

The presentation of the results and their resulting interpretations will be presented in two parts. The first part will consist of a presentation of the results of the analyses of variance run on the semantic differential. The second part will consist of the presentation of the results of the analyses of variance run on the Likert items.

PART ONE: Analyses of the Analysis of Variance on the Semantic Differential

A. The Analysis of the Three Dimensional Design Involving Sex

The first of the two three dimensional analyses of variance involved the possible interaction of three factors:

A factor....males versus females
B factor....control group versus experimental group
C factor....9th&10th graders versus 11th&12th graders versus college freshmen

Criterion measures used were the semantic differentials. The results of the

---

(footnote 24 continued from preceding page) blacks which were able to do what whites could do and not as producing blacks which were able to perform successfully.

[25] These eighth graders had completed the vast majority of their work and were within a few days of being accelerated to the ninth grade.

six Likert items will be reported in Part Two, after all the results of the semantic differentials have been completed.

1. first factor - PERSONALITY VALUE

The first factor to be reported from the results of the semantic differential was termed PERSONALITY VALUE and resulted from median scores of 240 subjects scoring the following three pairs of adjectives:

leader-follower[26]
easy-uneasy
ambitious for others-ambitious for himself

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among sex, grade level and role playing in the way subjects view the PERSONALITY VALUE of the bidialectal. Appropriate null hypotheses were formulated for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are shown below:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	8.06667	8.06667	1	3.934	0.049*
B	5.40000	5.40000	1	2.634	0.106
AB	.266667	.266667	1	0.130	0.719
C	7.75833	3.87917	2	1.892	0.153
AC	9.95933	4.92917	2	2.404	0.093
BC	14.4750	7.23750	2	3.530	0.031**
ABC	7.40833	3.70417	2	1.807	0.167
ERROR	467.500	2.05044	228		

*significant at .049 level
**significant at .031 level

The table shows two effects significant at a level where the risk of error was one which the experimenters were willing to assume.

The main A effect demonstrates that females, regardless of grade level and regardless of whether they were in the control group or in the experimental group, agreed significantly more than did males that a bidialectal person was likely to be characterized by the adjectives "easy", "leader," and "ambitious for others". The correlations between the "ambitious factor" and the two other factors, "easy" and "leader", were sufficiently neutral to indicate some ambiguity in opinion. Evidently some subjects felt that a bidialectal person would assume all three of these personality values, whereas other subjects felt that, although the bidialectal person might assume an easier manner and a more dominant personality, at the same time this bidialectal person might become more ambitious for himself than he did for others. However, the almost neutral correlation between the two pairs of adjectives, "selfish-unselfish" and "ambitious for others-ambitious for himself", may indicate that, for young blacks, being ambitious for oneself does not necessarily mean at the expense of others, but merely not in their interest. Thus these results may indicate that the black who tries to make it in a white world by become bidialectal does not infringe upon the rights of other blacks, but perhaps only on the rights of other whites.

---

[26] It should be again pointed out that the adjectival pair "leader-follower" replaced the two pairs of adjectives, "dominant-recessive" and "extrovert-introvert" on the final round of testing to prevent semantic breakdown.

The collapsed mean for the female cell was 2.10000, while the collapsed mean for the male cell was 2.46667, with a mean of 1.00000 being the most favorable opinion of the bidialectal person possible and a mean of 7.00000 being the most unfavorqble opinion of the bidialectal person. Therefore, although females were significantly more favorable in regard to PERSONALITY VALUE than were males, in general both males and females considered the bidialectal person as having favorable personality characteristics.

The significant BC interaction resulted from significant differences between cell B1C1 (control 9th&10th graders) and three other cells, B1C2 (control 11th&12th graders); B2C1 (experimental 9th&10th graders), and cell B2C1 (experimental 11th&12th graders). The means as indicated on the table below indicate that, although the lower grade levels were less likely to consider the PERSONALITY VALUE of the bidialectal person in a favorable light before they role played, these lower grade levels were the only group which shifted its opinion significantly in favor of the bidialectal person after role playing.

	B1	B2
C1	2.905	2.025
C2	2.175	1.925
C3	2.175	2.450

The reluctance of the college experimental group to follow the trend of the two younger groups in permitting the role playing process to increase their favorable opinions of the bidialectal person may be attributable to any one or a combination of the following factors:

a. role playing may not be an exercise which is effective with college level subjects in persuading them to think more favorably of the PERSONALITY VALUE of the bidialectal person when indirect measuring devices such as the semantic differential are used

b. sampling error. Subjectively to the experimenters, the college experimental group appeared to be more polite, more conventional, and perhaps more conservative than did the college control group, perhaps resulting in a group error. The college experimental group may have felt that they themselves were less black in their characteristics than they might have been and therefore, being less able to switch dialects, they were less favorably inclined toward a person who could. If this negative trend of the college experimental group had continued through their results on the Likert scales, the possibility of group error would have been more certain. However, the trend did not continue when the results of the Likert scales were analyzed.

c. the college level person may be more likely to consider the three adjectives used for this cluster as incongruous than would the subjects in the earlier levels of education. The college subjects may have given a more colloquial meaning to the term "easy" than did the younger students, may have shown more suspicion of a "leader", and may have had mixed feelings about the ambitions of the bidialectal person.

Although the main B effect and the AC interaction were not significant at levels which the experimenters thought sufficiently certain, it is of interest to look at the trends which they may establish. The main B effect was in the desired direction, with the control group giving a mean of 2.46667 and the experimental group giving a mean of 2.10000. The AC interaction indicates that college females were much more inclined to view the bidialectal person as having favorable PERSONALITY VALUES than were the college males, and that this trend was also evident for the 9th&10th grade level. The 11th&12th grade level, however, reversed this trend slightly, but the lack of agreement of the levels was not sufficient to cause a significant AC interaction or sufficient to prevent a main A effect which was significant.

2. second factor - SOCIAL CHARACTER

The second factor to be reported from the results of the semantic differential was termed SOCIAL CHARACTER was resulted from median scores of the following pairs of adjectives:

relaxed-tense
sociable-unsociable
comfortable-uncomfortable

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among sex, grade level and role playing in the way subjects view the SOCIAL CHARACTER of the bidialectal. Appropriate null hypotheses were formulated for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	6.01667	6.01667	1	2.166	0.147
B	.816667	.816667	1	0.287	0.593
AB	.600000	.600000	1	0.211	0.646
C	1.07500	.547000	2	0.189	0.828
AC	0.15833	7.91667	2	0.028	0.973
BC	2.70833	1.34517	2	0.476	0.622
ABC	13.7250	6.86250	2	2.413	0.092
ERROR	648.300	2.84342	228		

Since there were no results which were considered sufficiently significant at risks which the experimenters were willing to take, it is necessary to inquire into the possibilities of why such significances did not occur.

To begin with, correlations between the three items listed below were sufficiently encouraging to discourage the experimenters from attributing the lack of significant results to incongruity of the adjectival cluster. Correlations were as follows:

	relaxed	sociable	comfortable
relaxed	x	.33324	.37397
sociable	x	x	.40875
comfortable	x	x	x

Although the experimenters would have preferred that the correlations between the adjectives in the cluster be higher, given the ambiguity of life among North Carolina blacks, the correlations were in some respects surprisingly high.

In looking further, the difficulty with this factor of SOCIAL CHARACTER may have been that the black subjects were not certain of the degree to which being able to switch dialects would permit a person to have a favorable social character. In discussing the next factor of APPARENT CHARACTER, the experimenters will point out that the black subjects apparently felt that the bidialectal person appears to have adapted nicely to society, but it may that, in this factor, they were not convinced by the role playing that APPARENT CHARACTER and actual SOCIAL CHARACTER were identical. In all twelve cells of this three dimensional experiment, the means on SOCIAL CHARACTER were less than 4,0, demonstrating that the black subjects agreed that the bidialectal person tended to be in reality a sociable person. They declined to indicate, however, on the semantic differential used, that, after role playing, they felt that the bidialectal person exhibited any more sociability than they registered if they had not role played. The most favorable mean was in cell A2B1C1 (mean=2.6) whereas the least favorable mean was in cell A1,B2,C2 (mean=3.65).

The scripts had been written to try to make the bidialectal person appear relaxed, sociable and comfortable. However, the inability which the subjects themselves may have felt in their switching of dialects may have overridden the favorable aura which surrounded the bidialectal in the scripts. In revising the scripts, the experimenters might point out that all people do have the ability to shift dialects and therefore the capability of making themselves more relaxed, more sociable, and more comfrotable, particularly after they have practiced dialect siwtching. Such a change in the scripts might increase the favorable effects of role playing for this factor.

However, there is no getting around the fact that the beginner who is learning to swap dialects does experience some lack of ease at the beginning of his experiences, so that the failure of this factor of the semantic differential to produce significant results may reflect what would happen to many subjects if they choose to follow the bidialectal route.

3. third factor - APPARENT CHARACTER

The third factor to be reported from the results of the semantic differential which attempts to measure possible interactions between sex, grade level, and role playing was termed APPARENT CHARACTER, and resulted from median scores on the following three pairs of adjectives:

cool-strung out
hep-square
"with it"-"not with it"

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among sex, grade level and role playing in the way subjects view the APPARENT CHARACTER of the bidialectal. Appropriate null hypotheses were formulated for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	6.01667	6.01667	1	2.808	0.095
B	6.66667	6.66667	1	0.031	0.860
AB	6.01667	6.01667	1	2.808	0.095
C	18.0750	9.03750	2	4.218	0.016*
AC	1.80833	.904167	2	0.422	0.656
BC	13.0083	6.50417	2	3.036	0.050**
ABC	2.50833	1.25417	2	0.585	0.558
ERROR	488.500	2.14554	228		

*significant at .016 level

**significant at .05 level

The significant main C effect demonstrates that college students, regardless of sex and regardless of whether they were in the control group or in the experimental group, agreed less significantly than subjects at the other two grade levels in describing the bidialectal person as cool, hep and "with it". The means of all three levels [c1=2.325; C2=2.2875; C3=2.8875] described the bidialectal favorably in terms of the three adjectival cluster, but the college subjects were significantly less favorable than the 9th&10th graders and the 11th&12th graders.

The significant BC interaction resulted from significant differences between cell B2C3 and two other cells, B2C1 and B2C2, as is demonstrated by the table below:

	B1	B2
C1	2.500	2.150
C2	2.475	2.100
C3	2.575	3.200

Whereas both the 9th&10th graders moved in the desired direction and the 11th&12th graders moved in the desired direction, the college students moved in a direction contrary to that predicted by the experimenters. Although all three grade levels responded with considerable similarity in the control group, they differed in the way they reacted in the experimental group.

The reasons for the contrary movement of the college experimental group for this phase of the semantic differential could be similar to those offered for the contrary reaction of the college group to the first factor of the semantic differential, with one possible addition. The terms for this factor were taken altogether from the black vernacular. It may be that, although "cool", "hep", and "with it" are still sophisticated black English to 9th&10th graders and to 11th&12th graders, the terms have lost a portion of their appeal to college age students from the time that the semantic differential was developed until the time that the role playing exercises took place. This possible explanation is not reinforced, however, by the mean score of the college control group which was similar to that registered by the control groups at the other two levels.

The explanation does not appear to lie in an incongruity of terminology for the college group for the correlations between the three items forming this factor of the differential were encouraging:

	cool	hep	"with it"
cool	x	.52906	.49190
hep	x	x	.40244
with it	x	x	x

Although the main A effect and the AB interaction were not significant at levels deeped sufficient by the experimenters, it is of interest to discuss their trends. The main A effect again showed that females (mean=2.34167) moved more in the desired direction than did males (mean=2.65833). The trend of the AB interaction showed that the difference between males and females lay in the response of the control group rather than in the response of the experimental group.

B. The Analysis of the Three Dimensional Design Involving Achievement

The second of the two three dimensional analysis of variance involved the possible interaction of three factors:

A factor....non-achievers versus achievers
B factor....control group versus experimental group
C factor....9th&10th graders versus 11th&12th graders versus college freshmen

The criterion measures were the semantic differentials designed for this project.

1. first factor - PERSONALITY VALUE

The first factor to be reported in this section on achievement is again the factor described as PERSONALITY VALUE, and, as before, resulted from median scores on the following three pairs of adjectives:

leader-follower
easy-uneasy
ambitious for others-ambitious for himself

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among achievement, grade level and role playing in the way subjects view the PERSONALITY VALUE of the bidialectal. Appropriate null hypotheses were phrased for simple interactions and main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	1.06667	1.06667	1	0.506	0.477
B	3.75000	3.75000	1	1.780	0.183
AB	2.01667	2.01667	1	0.957	0.329
C	8.80833	4.40417	2	2.091	0.126
AC	4.00833	2.00417	2	0.951	0.388
BC	12.8250	6.41250	2	3.044	0.050*
ABC	2.15833	1.07917	2	0.512	0.600
ERROR	480.300	2.10658			

*significant at the .05 level

Again, as with the three dimensional design which featured sex as one of the variables, there was a significant BC interaction. This BC interaction resulted from significant differences between cell B1C1 (9th&10th control) and four other cells: B1C2, B1C3, B2C1, and B2C2. The means of the six cells are shown below, the achievement factor have been collapsed into the BC design, making the number of subjects in each cell forty.

	B1	B2
C1	2.900	2.050
C2	2.100	1.925
C3	2.175	2.450

The 9th&10th grade level shifted significantly in the desired direction. The attitude of the 9th&10th grade control group was significantly more negative toward the bidialectal person before role playing than were the 11th&12th grade control group and the college control group.

Again it was the failure of the college experimental group to move toward the predicted direction which eliminated the chances of a main B effect. The possible reasons for this failure have been discussed, and there were no extenuating circumstances here to be of further assistance in explaining the discrepancy in the manner in which the college group acted from the manner in which the younger groups acted.

2. second factor - SOCIAL CHARACTER

The second factor to be reported from the results of the semantic differential was termed SOCIAL CHARACTER, and, as with the previous three dimensional design with sex as one of the variables, it was based on median scores of the following pairs of adjectives:

relaxed-tense
sociable-unsociable
comfortable-uncomfortable

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among achievement, grade level and role playing in the way subjects view the SOCIAL CHARACTER of the bidialectal. Appropriate null hypotheses were phrased for the simple interactions and the main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIOS	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	.704167	.704167	1	0.256	0.613
B	3.03750	3.03750	1	0.104	0.294
AB	2.20417	2.20417	1	0.801	0.372
C	.758333	.379167	2	0.138	0.871
AC	2.25833	1.12917	2	0.411	0.664
BC	.525000	.262500	2	0.095	0.909
ABC	8.95833	4.47917	2	1.629	0.198
ERROR	627.050	2.75022			

There were no significant differences which even approximated risks which the experimenters were willing to run.

3. third factor - APPARENT CHARACTER

The third factor to be reported from the results of the semantic differential was termed APPARENT CHARACTER, an outward manifestation of the bidialectal person, and resulted from median scores on the following three pairs of adjectives:

cool-strung out
hep-square
"with it"-"not with it"

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among achievement, grade level and role playing in the way subjects view the APPARENT CHARACTER of the bidialectal. Appropriate null hypotheses were phrased for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	.0041667	.0041667	1	0.002	0.965
B	.204167	.204167	1	0.094	0.760
AB	.104167	.104167	1	0.048	0.827
C	14.5083	7.25417	2	3.331	0.038*
AC	3.85833	1.92917	2	0.886	0.414
BC	13.1083	6.55417	2	3.009	0.051**
ABC	1.65833	.829167	2	0.381	0.684
ERROR	496.550	2.17785	228		

*significant at the .038 level **significant at the .051 level

As with the three dimensional design involving sex differences, there was again a significant main C effect, and again the C effect was caused by the significantly different way in which the collapsed college cell performed. The means are shown felow:

C1=2.3625
C2=2.3000
C3=2.8500

This main C effect is clarified by the significant BC interaction, revealing that it was cell B2C3 (the college experimental group) which accounted for the entire interaction, by differing significantly from each of the other five cells. The means are given below:

	B1	B2
C1	2.425	2.300
C2	2.500	2.100
C3	2.500	3.200

Again it was the failure of the college experimental group to perform in the manner predicted by the experimenters which eliminated the possibility of a main B effect.

As with previous results on the semantic differential, there was no support for any difference in the performances of achievers and non-achievers.

PART TWO: Analyses of the Analysis of Variance on the Six Likert Items

A. The Analysis of the Three Dimensional Design Involving Sex

Again, the first of the two three dimensional analyses of variance involved the possible interaction of three factors:

A factor.....males versus females
B factor.....control group versus experimental group
C factor.....9th&10th graders versus 11th&12th graders versus College freshmen

The criterion measures were six linear scales.

1. first linear scale - PLEASED WITH WAY THEY SPEAK

The first area of inquiry concerned whether role playing would effect the degree to which subjects were pleased with the way they were speaking. When the item was formulated, the experimenters reasoned that the results might go one of two ways: subjects who role played could become more pleased with the way they spoke because of the pride in Black English expressed in the scripts; or subjects could become less pleased with the way they spoke because of an increasing awareness that they could not switch dialects as skillfully as the people who were praised in the scripts could switch dialects.

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among sex, grade level and role playing in the way subjects express pleasure in the way they now speak. The Likert item read: What is your present attitude toward the way you sound when you speak? and the subjects could choose among five answers, ranging from "I am not at all pleased with the way I speak" to "I am very pleased with the way I speak". Appropriate null hypotheses were phrased for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	.204167	.204167	1	0.079	0.779
B	11.7042	11.7042	1	4.526	0.034*
AB	.337500	.337500	1	0.131	0.718
C	5.20833	2.60417	2	1.007	0.367
AC	10.5083	5.25417	2	2.032	0.133
BC	1.30833	.654167	2	0.253	0.777
ABC	8.57500	4.28750	2	1.658	0.193
ERROR	589.550	2.58575	228		

*significant at .034 level

The main B effect was significant in shifting the opinions of blacks toward being more pleased with the way they were speaking, from a mean of 4.175 for the collapsed control group to a mean of 4.616 for the collapsed experimental group, with the most favorable mean toward the way they spoke being 5.0. Therefore, the role playing made the subjects approach more closely the place where they said, "I am very pleased with the way I speak."

Two observations are relevant here. First, many blacks feel that they can not switch dialects, since they have been the minority group which has had to conform to the wishes of the majority group. There appears little evidence as to whether blacks can actually make this switch or whether they simple like to think of themselves as bidialectal. If they can make the switch, then this significant main B effect shows that they secured reinforcement for what they are now doing. If they cannot make the switch but wish they could, the main B effect may show that the blacks have become more pleased with their own way of speaking as a result of the role playing process.

Many blacks who speak a rather pure form of Black English hear themselves speaking "standard" English. If these blacks considered themselves as speakers of "standard" English, then the main B effect shows that the role playing process made them more inclined to think that they could keep their "standard" English and use their Black English without fear of being condemned. Do the high averages of blacks on this question indicate that blacks are pleased with speaking Black English, or do they indicate that blacks are pleased with speaking what they think they speak, i.e., they think they speak "standard" English, whereas their actual speech patterns, like whites in their area, differ considerably from "standard" English ahd conform with relative consisten to the grammar, vocabulary, phonology, and kinesics of the Black English of their geographic area.

2. second linear scale - LEARNING FORMAL & INFORMAL ENGLISH

The second area of inquiry to be investigated by a Likert scale was whether role playing would affect the degree to which subjects were interested in learning to speak both formal and informal English as a result of the role playing exercise.

The null hypotheses formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among sex, grdde level and role playing the way subjects express a desire to learn to speak both formal and informal English. The Likert item read: How interested are you in being able to speak more than one way, so that you could use informal English dialect in informal situations and formal English dialect in formal situations--an informal situation would be social conversation with your friends at school and a formal situation would be the way you would speak during most job interviews? Subjects could choose from among give answers, ranging from "I am not at all interested in learning how to talk any way but the way I do" and "I am highly enthusiastic about learning how to speak formally and informally". Appropriate null hypotheses were formulated for simple interactions and main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	2.01667	2.01667	1	1.947	0.164
B	.600000	.600000	1	0.579	0.447
AB	.0666667	.0666667	1	0.064	0.800
C	10.6750	5.33750	2	5.154	0.006*
AC	.858333	.439167	2	0.414	0.661
BC	3.47500	1.73750	2	1.678	0.189
ABC	2.05833	1.02917	2	0.994	0.372
ERROR	236.100	1.03553			

*significant at the .006 level

The main C effect resulted from the high school cell (mean=3.7) and the college cell (mean-3.6) differing significantly from the 9th&10th grade cell (mean=3.2). The differentiation can be attributed to the more impressionable younger students who may have been strongly influenced by traditional English teacher that there is only one corrdct way of speaking English. Therefore, they exhibited less interest in learning to speak any way other than that dictated to them by their English teachers.

However, the averages of all three levels was encouraging. The youngest age group indicated a mean which was greater than "I am somewhat interested in learning how to speak formally and informally" and the middle and oldest age groups indicated means which approximated "I am enthusiastic about learning how to speak formally and informally". Although the overall B effect was in the direction desired by the experimenters, it did not achieve significance. The 9th&10th graders shifted encouragingly in the desired direction (from a mean of 3.025 to a mean of 3.450), but the 11th&12th graders remained relatively constant while the college age level showed some regression, again an indication that some group error may have been operating in the college experimental group.

3. third linear scale - SPEAK CORRECT ENGLISH AT ALL TIMES

The third area of inquiry to be investigated by a linear scale concerned whether role playing would affect the degree to which subjects would feel that everyone should speak correct English at all times.

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among sex, grade level and role playing in the way subjects feel that everyone should try to speak correct English at all times. The Likert item read: Everyone should try to speak correct English at all times, with "strongly disagree" at the left end of the scale, "undecided" in the middle, and "strongly agree" on the right hand side of the scale. Appropriate null hypotheses were phrased for simple interactions and main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	14.5042	14.5042	1	2.018	0.157
B	49.5042	49.5042	1	6.889	0.009*
AB	14.5042	14.5042	1	2.018	0.157
C	59.9083	29.9542	2	4.168	0.017**
AC	27.3583	13.6792	2	1.904	0.151
BC	47.0083	23.5042	2	3.271	0.040***
ABC	6.05833	3.02917	2	0.422	0.657
ERROR	1638.45	7.18618	228		

*significant at .009 level
**significant at .017 level
***significant at .040 level

This item had been designed to require subjects to move to the left to register an opinion which would probably be in contrast to the opinions they were receiving from hhe authority figures in the school. The results show that the main B effect was in the direction predicted by the experimenters, from a mean of 6.008 for the collapsed control group to a mean of 5.100 for the collapsed experimental group. The main C effect was attributable to a decidedly lower mean for the college age group (mean=4.862) in contrast to the means for the two other levels (9th&10th grade mean=5.775; 11th&12th grade mean=6.025).

The meaning of these main effects is clarified by the significant BC interaction which demonstrated that it was the high school control group with its mean of 7.100 which differed significantly from the mean scores of all the other five cells.

	B1	B2
C1	5.850	5.700
C2	7.100	4.950
C3	5.075	4.650

It is notable that, in this instance, the college experimental cell moved in the desired direction. This movement is in contradiction to the movement of the college experimental cell during the analysis of the semantic differential.

4. fourth linear scale - INFORMAL ENGLISH SOMETIMES COMMUNICATES BETTER

The fourth area of inquiry to be explored by a Likert scale concerned whether informal English could sometimes communicate better than formal English.

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among sex, grade level and role playing in the respect in which subjects propose that informal English can sometimes communicate better than formal English. The Likert item read: Informal English (dialectical English or English spoken with an accent) sometimes communicates better in some situations than does formal English. Appropriate null hypotheses were phrased for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	17.6042	17.6042	1	3.846	0.051*
B	34.5042	34.5042	1	7.539	0.007**
AB	.504167	.504167	1	0.110	0.740
C	60.3083	30.1542	2	6.588	0.002***
AC	15.8083	79.0417	2	1.727	0.180
BC	4.60833	23.0417	2	0.503	0.605
ABC	9.40833	4.70417	2	1.028	0.359
ERROR	1043.355	4.57697	228		

*significant at .051 level
**significant at .007 level
***significant at .002 level

The main A effect demonstrated that, regardless of control and experimental group differences and regardless of grade level, males (mean=6.925) were significantly more of the opinion than females (mean=6.383) that informal English sometimes communicates better than formal English. This result is probably a reflection of the effort of the male black to assert his authority position, usurped' in the past by the female. It also demonstrates that the past experiences of the female required her to conform more closely to the norms of white society.

The main B effect showed that, regardless of control and experimental grouping and regardless of grade level, experimental subjects (mean=7.033) shifted significantly more than control subjects (mean=6.275). This shift was in the predicted direction, i.e., that informal English could communicate better in some situations than could formal English. It is of importance that both control and experimental means showed that blacks felt rather strongly that informal English had its place, and it would be interesting to discover whether they hold these opinions as a result of encouragement by school philosophies or spite of resistance to them by school philosophies.

The main C effect showed that the college group was significantly more favorable toward a possible place for informal English than were the high school or junior high groups. The means were as follows:

C1.....6.325
C2.....6.275
C3.....7.362

It should be noted that the college experimental group again registered a mean more favorable toward bidialectalism than did the college control group. In fact, the college experimental group registered the highest mean of the six cells of a two-dimensional BC grouping with a mean of 7.65, males (mean=7.70) showing a slightly higher mean than females (mean=7.60). Thus, the manner in which the college experimental group functioned during the semantic differential is contradicted by its reaction on this Likert item.

5. fifth linear scale - BIDIALECTALS NOT TRUE TO THEMSELVES

The fifth area of interest to be investigated by a linear scale concerned whether role playing would affect the degree to which subjects felt that the bidialectal person was being true to himself.

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among sex, grade level and role playing in the way in which subjects say they feel the bidialectal person is being true to himself. The Likert item read: People who learn to speak two or more dialects of their own language are being true to themselves. Appropriate null hypotheses were phrased for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	8.81667	8.81667	1	1.963	0.163
B	22.8167	22.8167	1	5.079	0.025*
AB	6.01667	6.01667	1	1.339	0.248
C	8.633	4.31667	2	0.961	0.384
AC	7.6333	3.81667	2	0.850	0.429
BC	6.53333	3.26667	2	0.727	0.484
ABC	2.43333	0.21667	2	0.271	0.763
ERROR	1024.30	4.49254	228		

*significant at .025 level

The results of the main B effect show that, regardless of sex and regardless of grade level, role playing did cause subjects to feel significantly different about the integrity of the bidialectal person. The mean on the pretest group was 5.80000, while the mean of the posttest group was 6.41667, showing a significant movement of the experimental group toward feeling that the bidialectal person was being true to himself.

It is gain of interest to examine the contrasting positions of cell B1C3 and cell B2C3, i.e., the college control and experimental groups. The means of 5.425 and 6.275 respectively show that the collegel level group moved in the predicted direction, thus casting further doubt upon the results reported for these cells in the section on the semantic differential being attributable to sampling error.

6. sixth linear scale - ENCOURAGED TO BE PROUD OF DIALECT PLUS STANDARD ENGLISH

The sixth area of inquiry to be explored by a Likert scale concerned whether subjects would feel that they should be encouraged to be proud of speaking their own dialect, while they were learning standard English. The second Likert item had asked whether they themselves were enthusiastic about learning two dialects; the sixth item endeavored to explore whether blacks should be encouraged (by the school, community, parents, etc.) to be bidialectal

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among sex, grade level and role playing in the way subjects say that they should be encouraged to be proud of speaking their own dialect while they learn standard English along side of it. The Likert item read: Students should be encouraged to be proud of speaking their own dialect while, at the same time, they learn standard English along side of it. Appropriate null hypotheses were phrased for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	4.00417	4.00417	1	0.830	0.363
B	6.33750	6.33750	1	1.314	0.253
AB	3.30417	3.30417	1	0.457	0.500
C	28.3000	14.01500	2	2.935	0.055*
AC	11.4333	5.71667	2	0.186	0.307
BC	12.3000	6.65000	2	1.379	0.254
ABC	3.03333	1.51667	2	0.315	0.730
ERROR	1099.35	4.82171	228		

*significant at .055 level

Although the means of the main B effect here moved in the predicted direction, from a mean of 7.350 for the control group to a mean of 7.675 for the experimental group, the degree of shift was not sufficient to produce significance, and the results of the main A effect show that it was the reluctance of females to more strongly endorse the bidialectal philosophy which prevented significance from being reached. Mean for males was 7.64167, while the mean for females was 7.38333. A look at the AC interaction showed that it was the experimental 9th&10th grade females with a mean of only 6.6000 which prevented a significant B effect from taking place. It can be reasoned that these young females, so much under the influence of their black and white teachers who were endeavoring to teach them standard English, were reluctant to encourage a bidialectal philosophy.

The significant main C effect showed that the mean of the collapsed 11th-&12th graders differed significantly from the mean of the 9th&10th graders. The younger students were again the most conservative. The means of the collapsed C cells were as follows:

C2........7.8000
C3........7.6000
C1........7.0000

Again it should be noted that all three of these means show a favorable attitude by black students toward bidialectalism.

B. The Analysis of the Three Dimensional Design Involving Achievement

Again, the second of the two three dimensional analyses of variance involved the possible interaction of three factors:

A factor.....achievement
B factor.....control group versus experimental group
C factor.....9th&10th graders versus 11th&12th graders versus
college freshmen

The criterion measures were six linear scales.

1. first scale - PLEASED WITH WAY THEY SPEAK

The first area of inquiry concerned whether role playing would affect the degree to which subjects were pleased with the way they were then speaking. The null hypothesis was: There will be no triple interaction among achievement, grade level, and role playing in the way subjects say they are pleased with the way they are speaking. Appropriate null hypotheses were formulated for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	1.06667	1.06667	1	0.434	0.511
B	11.2667	11.2667	1	4.581	0.033*
AB	3.75000	3.75000	1	1.525	0.218
C	4.63333	2.31667	2	0.942	0.391
AC	4.13333	2.06667	2	0.840	0.433
BC	1.23333	.616667	2	0.251	0.778
ABC	12.40000	6.20000	2	2.521	0.083
ERROR	560.700	2.45921	228		

*significant at .033 level

As with the triple interaction featuring sex differences instead of achievement differences, there was a significant B main effect, with the difference in means being 4.1750 for the control group and 4.60833 for the experimental group.

Since there was again some trend toward a triple interaction, an examination of the twelve means for each of the twelve cells was made. These means showed that the tendency was for the achievers to shift opinion more than the non-achievers, except for the 9th&10th grade non-achievers whose post-test mean of 4.7 was equal to the post-test mean of the 9th&10th grade achievers. The tendency toward a triple interaction was also enhanced by the post-test results of the non-achieving 11th&12th graders who tended to move in a negative direction, from a mean of 4.4 in the control group to a mean of 3.5 in the experimental group.

2. second scale = LEARNING FORMAL & INFORMAL ENGLISH

The second area of inquiry concerned whether role playing would improve the desire of blacks to speak both formally and informally. The null hypothesis testes was: There will be no triple interaction among achievement, grade level and role playing in the way subjects express an interest in learning how to speak both formally and informally. Appropriate hypotheses were formulated for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	.016667	.016667	1	0.016	0.901
B	.26667	.266667	1	0.250	0.617
AB	.150000	.150000	1	0.141	0.708
C	11.0083	5.50417	2	5.164	0.006*
AC	1.85833	.929167	2	0.872	0.420
BC	2.05833	1.02917	2	0.966	0.382
ABC	1.57500	.787500	2	0.739	0.479
ERROR	243.000	1.06579	228		

*significant at the .006 level

Again there was no indication of an A effect. The C effect was attributable to the significant differences between the 9th&10th grade level and the two other grade levels, for the mean of the lowest grade level was 3.1875 and differed significantly in its enthusiasm about learning to speak formally and informally from the mean of the 11th&12th graders (mean=3.6875) and from the college freshmen (mean=3.5750). But all three means were again encouraging toward bidialectalism, indicating an interest in learning to speak both formally and informally.

3. third linear scale - SPEAK CORRECT ENGLISH AT ALL TIMES

The third area of inquiry concerned whether role playing would effect the degree to which subjects would feel that everyone should speak correct English at all times.

The null hypothesis formulated was: There will be no triple interaction among achievement, grade level and role playing in the way in which subjects say that everyone should try to speak correct English at all times. Appropriate null hypotheses were formulated for the simple interactions and the main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	19.8375	19.8375	1	2.685	0.103
B	51.3375	51.3375	1	6.950	0.009*
AB	7.00417	7.00417	1	0.948	0.331
C	64.2250	32.1125	2	4.347	0.014**
AC	.97500	.487500	2	0.066	0.936
BC	50.9250	25.4625	2	3.447	0.034***
ABC	1.10833	.554167	2	0.075	0.928
ERROR	1684.25	7.38706	228		

*significant at .009 level **significant at .014 level ***sig. at .034 level

The significant main B and C effects and the BC interaction operated in a manner similar to that which occurred in the three dimensional design concerned with sex, grade level and role playing, and so will not be discussed further here.

Although the A effect was significant only at the .103 level and therefore the experimenters were not willing to report such a risk as significant, they were interested in noting that the trend of the main A effect was toward a greater shift for the achievers (mean=5.175) than for the non-achievers (mean=5.75). Although each of the six cells for the achievers had a lower and therefore a less favorable opinion of trying to speak correct English at all times than did each of its companion cells among the non-achievers, the differences were not significantly great to reach the level of significance set by the experimenters for this study. It would appear that, once the North Carolina school system has become more stable in its integration process and the definition of achievement has become less a racial matter and more of an academic matter, significance in this area in favor of achievers should be reached at a more encouraging level of significance.

4. fourth linear scale - INFORMAL ENGLISH SOMETIMES COMMUNICATES BETTER

The fourth area of inquiry to be explored concerned whether informal English sometimes communicates better than formal English.

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among achievement, grade level and role playing in the manner in which subjects say that informal English sometimes communicates better than formal English. Appropriate null hypotheses were formulated for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

---

[27] The only difference was that the cells B1C1 and B1C2 did not differ significantly at the .05 level from each other, whereas these cells had differed significantly in the design with sex differences.

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	10.0042	10.0042	1	2.142	0.145
B	28.7042	28.7042	1	6.145	0.014*
AB	.00416667	.00416667	1	0.001	0.976
C	53.4250	26.7125	2	5.719	0.004**
AC	58.5833	29.2917	2	0.627	0.535
BC	.058333	.0291667	2	0.006	0.994
ABC	6.45833	3.32917	2	0.691	0.052
ERROR	1064.95	4.67083			

*significant at .014 level ** significant at .004 level

The significant main B and C effects have been discussed under the three dimensional design concerning sex differences, and that discussion will not be repeated here.

Again, although the A main effect was significant only at the .145 level, the trend of the means was in the same direction as with the previous Likert scale, with a mean of 6.43333 for the non-achievers and a mean of 6.84167 for the achievers. With one exception, i.e., the 8th&10th grade control group, the achievers scores were consistently higher than those of the non-achievers, and this effect was particularly marked at the college level (mean for non-achievers =7.0; mean for achievers=8.3). Since it was at the college level and perhaps there alone that the data of the experimenters could be said to distinguish with relative certainty the achiever from the non-achiever, the trend of more effective results from role playing by achievers is again indicated. However, it should be repeated that both achievers and non-achievers showed favorable opinions toward the proposition that informal English sometimes communicates better in some situations than does formal English.

5. fifth linear scale - BIDIALECTALS NOT TRUE TO THEMSELVES

The fifth area of interest to be investigated by the Likert scales dealt with the degree to which a bidialectal person was being true to himself.

The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among achievement, grade level and role playing concerning the way in which subjects say that the person who speaks two or more dialects is being true to himself. Appropriate null hypotheses were formulated for the simple interactions and main effects.

The results of the computer print out were as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	12.15000	12.15000	1	2.657	0.104
B	11.2667	11.2667	1	2.464	0.118
AB	.816667	.816667	1	0.179	0.673
C	10.03333	5.01667	2	1.097	0.336
AC	7.50000	3.75000	2	0.820	0.442
BC	12.93333	6.46667	2	1.414	0.245
ABC	9.73333	4.86667	2	1.064	0.347
ERROR	1042.50	4.56237			

Modifications in the sample drawn for the achievement portion of the investigation resulted in an elimination of the significant main B effect which has occurred in the sample drawn for the three dimensional design concerning sex.

The collapsed means of the B effect for this design were 5.85000 for the control and 6.28333 for the experimental, whereas the collapsed means for the main B effect for the design involving sex differences were 5.8000 for the control and 6.41667 for the experimental group, enough difference to cause one of the designs to show a significant difference and for the other design not to show a significant difference.

Although the main A effect is not significant at a level which the experimenters were willing to risk, it does move in the direction consistent with previous A main effects, with a mean of 5.84167 for the control and a mean of 6.29167 for the experimental. A look at the means in the 12 cells shows that four of the six pairs moved in a direction which would show a more favorable response to bidialectalism among achievers. The two non-conforming pairs were the college control (the non-achievers had a mean of 5.50000 compared to a mean of 5.2500 for the achievers) and the experimental 11th&12th grade cell where means of 6.300 for the non-achievers exceeded the mean of 6.1500 for the achievers. Both of these differences, however, could be attributed to chance.

It is important to point out again that the means reported for the BC effect show that, at the college level, the experimental group (mean=6.275) showed a more favorable attitude toward having the bidialectal person being true to himself than did the control group (mean-5.375), again an indication that something more than sampling error must have been taking place in the college groups which scored the semantic differentials.

6. sixth linear scale - ENCOURAGED TO BE PROUD OF DIALECT PLUS STANDARD ENGLISH

The sixth area of inquiry explored whether subjects would feel that they should be encouraged to be proud of speaking their own dialect,while, at the same time, they were learning standard English along side of it. The null hypothesis formulated was as follows: There will be no triple interaction among achievement, grade level, and role playing in the way subjects say that they should be encouraged to be proud of speaking their own dialect while, at the same time, they were learning standard English along side of it. Appropriate null hypotheses were formulated for simple interactions and for main effects.

The results of the computer print out are as follows:

SOURCE	SUMS OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	DF	F RATIO	PROBABILITY
BETWEEN SUBJECTS					
A	24.7042	24.7042	1	5.641	0.018*
B	7.00417	7.00417	1	1.599	0.207
AB	.037500	.037500	1	0.009	0.926
C	31.3083	15.6542	2	3.574	0.030**
AC	8.60833	4.30417	2	0.983	0.376
BC	12.6583	6.32917	2	1.445	0.238
ABC	41.0250	20.5125	2	4.684	0.010***
ERROR	998.550	4.37961	228		

*significant at .018 level **significant at .030 level ***sig. at .010 level

The implications of the significant main C effect were discussed in the previous section where sex was the third dimension, and that discussion will not be repeated here. Therefore, the triple interaction will be discussed first, followed by a discussion of the main A effect.

Cell A1B1C1 had a low mean of 5.750, and therefore this cell of 9th&10th grade control non-achievers differed significantly from the means of all of the other eleven cells except A1B2C3, the college experimental non-achiever cell which exhibited a mean of 6.5000. This result meant that the 9th&10th grade control non-achievers even differed from the 9th&10th grade control achiever cell, with a difference of means from 5.750 to 7.700.[28] Thus the lowest grade non-achiever control is the most reluctant to encourage dialectal speaking alone side of standard English.

Cell A1B2C3, the college experimental non-achiever, with its conservative mean of 6.5000, differed significantl7 from four other cells: first, it differed from the college achiever experimental cell which had a mean of 8.6000; second, it differed from the 11th&12th grade experimental achiever with its mean of 8.150; third it differed from the 11th&12th grade control non-achiever group with its mean of 7.950; and fourth, it differed from the college experimental non-achiever cell with its mean of 7.850.

Finally, the appearance of the significant triple interaction is explained by the action of cell A2B2C1, the 9th&10th grade experimental achievers. With their third most conservative mean, these achievers differed significantly from cell A2B2C3, the college experimental achievers.

The general trend of the triple interaction is to show that the lower grade level combined with the factor of non-achievement reduces the influence of the role playing process.

It is interesting to note that the only means which exceeded the score of 8.00000 (with 9.0000 being the highest possible mean score) were in this analysis and consisted of the 11th&12th grade and college experimental achiever groups. The college experimental achiever mean is particularly high, and shows the very favorable response of college students to bidialectalism, even though these college students are probably not being reinforced in this opinion by their college teachers.

---

[28] In general we have not reported in table form the results of the simple interactions and main effects produced by the computer using the Duncan modified least significant difference test. All of these differences were programmed to be significant at the .05 level. However, in the case of the triple interaction, it seems advisable to report the results in detail.

IDENTIFICATION	MEANS	MEANS FOLLOWED BY SAME LETTER OR IN A STRAIGHT LINE ARE NOT SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT FROM EACH OTHER AT .05 LEVEL
A2B2C3	8.6000	A
A2B2C2	8.1500	AB
A1B2C2	7.9500	AB
A2B1C3	7.8500	AB
A2B1C2	7.8000	ABC
A1B2C1	7.7000	ABC
A1B1C3	7.7000	ABC
A1B1C2	7.6000	ABC
A2B1C1	7.4000	ABC
A2B2C1	7.2500	BC
A1B2C3	6.5000	CD
A1B1C1	5.7500	D

Two other observations should be made before proceeding to the discussion of the main A effect. First, the means of all twelve cells were favorable toward students being encouraged to be proud of speaking their own dialect, while, at the same time, they learned standard English along side of it. Second, the BC interaction means showed that the mean of the college control group was 7.775 whereas the mean of the college experimental group was 7.550, supporting the conservative tendencies of the college experimental group so evident in the analyses of the results from the semantic differential.

This sixth Likert item was the only one which showed an A effect at a risk sufficiently low so that the experimenters felt warranted in calling the difference in the means significant. Means were 7.2000 for non-achievers and 7.84167 for achievers, again indicating that achievers show a more favorable attitude toward bidialectalism than do non-achievers. However, the mean of 7.2000 for non-achievers is far from exhibiting negative tendencies toward bidialectal instruction.

CONCLUSIONS

This section will be divided into three parts: the most significant findings; the limitations of the study; and the implications for further study.

1. Findings

The specific results have been reported in the body of the report. Comments here will be reserved to general trends noted by the experimenters.

In the opinion of the experimenters, the most significant conclusion of the experiment was that blacks in North Carolina public school systems, judging from the sample of 240 drawn for this experiment, are favorable toward the bidialectal person and, it could be inferred, toward bidialectal instruction. All of the means in all of the cells for all three factors in both of the three dimensional designs measured by the semantic differential were less than 4.000, i.e., they consistently were in some manner complimentary to the bidialectal person. The means of the cells for four of the five Likert scales were also all greater than the neutral reference point, thus showing consistently favorable opinions of the black who could speak more than one dialect. The only exception was the Likert scale which read: Everyone should try to speak correct English at all times, where the experimenters had purposefully suggested an opinion contrary to the philosophy of the experiment. For this Likert scale, the average of the four means reported for the main B effect, two means taken from the three dimensional design having sex as the third variable and two means taken from the three dimensional design having achievement as the third variable, was 5.50844. In comparing the two means of the two control groups with the two means of the two experimental groups for this third Likert item, the mean of the control group was 5.96666 as compared with the mean of the experimental group of 5.0500. Although the mean of the experimental group reflects the significant shifts of opinion resulting from the role playing, even the mean of the control group could hardly be said to agree with the instructional philosophy that most black students are exposed to in their English classes.

The accumulative effect of this fsvorable opinion of blacks toward the bidialectal person surprised the experimenters, who, in developing the role playing scripts and in developing the semantic differential, had encountered considerable vocal opposition to the bidialectal philosophy among certain blacks. These hostile blacks continued to be evident in the later stages of the experiment, judging from an occasional negative set of scores from a particular subject. But the opposition expressed in the initial stages of the experiment was apparently from a vocal minority which could not be said to represent the trend of the opinions expressed by the great majority of subjects. Whether this favorable attitude toward the bidialectal would persist if the subjects had been asked to make some overt commitment to bidialectalism is a matter which needs further investigation.

The implications of this finding for the North Carolina public school system may not be known for some time, for there appears to be sufficient pressure from parents in particular, but also from selected school administrators, supervisors, and classroom teachers to present any organized approach toward bidialectal instruction. This opposition may diminish as the novelty of integration wears off. However, for the present, if the black subjects of this study are representative, it cannot be said that the great majority of black students themselves are adding to the pressure against bidialectalism, at least if the opinions of these subjects on the pencil-and-paper tests reflect what would happen if they were actually involved in a bidialectal program.

A second finding is that the semantic differential may be too sophisticated a measuring device to be used with non-sophisticated groups, and particularly with non-achievers, unless several steps are taken:

1. The directions for the differential may need to be adapted more closely to Black English, at least to the place where blacks can grasp the conceptual processes in a language which they are accustomed to use for conceptual thinking.

2. Subjects should be introduced to the semantic differential a week or so before they are asked to use it for experimental purposes, thus removing its novelty and hopefully its ambiguity.

3. Subjects should have explained to them how the semantic differential attempts to register shifts of opinion. The brighter and more alert students in particular wanted to know "what the experiment was all about" and this set of wanting more information in return for cooperation may have influenced the results. For example, it may be that the college experimental group reacted in a manner contrary to that predicted by the experimenters because it was puzzled about the implications of what was transpiring. Not knowing exactly what they were about may have made the college experimental group suspicious, and so they were reluctant to commit themselves to bidialectalism on a criterion measure the objectives of which were obscure. When the more direct Likert scales were used, this college experimental group performed largely in the manner predicted by the experimenters.

A third finding is that the study presents considerable evidence that role playing can change the opinions of blacks in favor of bidialectalism. As was pointed out in the introduction, this experiment was inspired by classroom teachers who said that they were sympathetic toward bidialectalism, but that they did not know how to motivate their students to learn English under any conditions, "unidialectal" or bidialectal. Such teachers reported a general apathy in their classrooms toward the study of English. Although the evidence is not as overwhelming as the experimenters had hoped, it is highly indicative and should become even stronger once the techniques for using role playing to motivate bidialectalism had been improved. The fact that there were significant main B effects in favor of bidialectalism in four of the six Likert scales[29] indicates that role playing can provide more favorable opinions toward bidialectalism. These results, together with the significant shift of opinion of the 9th&10th grade level on the PERSONALITY VALUE of the semantic differential[30], plus the general trend of the means of the B effects, is encouraging enough to justify more exploration into how role playing can motivate students to learn standard English along side of their own dialect.

When it is recalled that the experimental groups only role played for one short session of about twenty minutes, the trend of the results is even more indicative. If role playing were to be used as a part of the classroom procedures in English, the exercise could be repeated during the semester to reinforce the effects noted here, with new scripts to prevent a practice effect from diminishing the motivating effect. Such repeated exposure to role playing might produce sizeable and consistent shifts of opinion, particularly after students got more skillful in reading scripts featuring dialects and particularly if the students themselves began writing the scripts and, in the long run, began improvising the role playing situations.

Fourth, there is some indication which may prove that blacks react differently to the direct and indirect measures for determining reactions to bidialectalism, particularly at the college level. It may be that the more mature blacks harbor some resentment of the bidialectal, and that this resentment exhibited itself in the reaction of the college experimental group when the college freshmen were asked to use an indirect measure to evaluate attitudes toward bidialectalism. However, when these same subjects were asked to respond to an overt question on bidialectalism where they were made aware of what perhaps they ought to think, they responded largely in favor of bidialectalism. Future researchers may wish to note whether this indication may be reinforced in other studies.

Fifth, although the results were not altogether consistent, particularly for college students using the semantic differential, the general trend was for the 9th&10th grade control groups to adhere to the norms of their teachers and register only moderately favorable attitudes toward bidialectalism in comparison with older control groups who were more favorable toward bidialectalism. However, after role playing, these younger groups often shifted more than the older subjects, showing that the younger students could have their moderately favorable opinions made more enthusiastic by role playing. Grade level was not a consistent favor in opinion shift. The results of the semantic differential favored the younger students as far as their responding in the direction predicted by the experimenters; the results of the Likert scales showed no trends as far as age level was concerned, for, in two of the Likert scales, college students showed the greatest shift of means; in two others, high school students showed the greatest shift in means; in the remaining two, the 9th&10th graders showed the greatest shift of means.

Sixth, achievers appeared to be generally more receptive to bidialectalism than did non-achievers, although, because of the problems encountered by the experimenters, this finding must be accepted as highly tentative.

---

[29] For the "true to themselves" scale, the main B effect was significant only in the three dimensional design which included sex differences as a factor.

[30] The PERSONALITY VALUE dimension was only significant in the three dimensional design which included sex differences as a factor.

Seventh, sex did not appear to be a factor in modifying attitudes toward bidialectalism. At times, males shifted more significantly; at other times, females shifted more significantly. It would appear that the sex differences may lie in the particular item being tested, and further research may indicate which type of item females respond mostt favorably to and which type of item males respond most favorably to.

2. Limitations

The chief limitation of the study was the unsatisfactory definition of achievement which the experimenters finally had to accept. In retrospect, they might have done better to seek out particular school systems which proved in advance to have established methods not only for labeling non-achievers by some objective standards but also for placing non-achievers among the more routinely conducted classes. Their efforts to seek out the classes labeled "non-achievers" were curtailed by the inability of students who had been specifically assigned to non-achieving groups to grasp the essentials of the semantic differential.

The experimenters observed that, with the many pressures which are now being exerted on the North Carolina public schools, even under the best of circumstances, it would be very difficult to obtain clear-cut definitions of black achievers and black non-achievers. Must of the energy of the public school system at present is to avoid putting the label of non-achiever on the black, particularly if labeling the black as a non-achiever automatically makes the white an achiever. The school systems are endeavoring to achieve the quietude and harmony which will allow them to progress through a very difficult period. If clear-cut academic distinctions must give way to the important objective of simply making integration work, then the schools must be willing to make this adjustment. This is understandable. And this is what the school systems appear to be doing. The systems often sense that their means of determing who is an achiever and who is not an achiever are somehow rooted in black-white standards which may be quite artificial, but they are not yet able to emerge from this quiet realization to adopt an evaluative system which avoids the racial sets. This will come in time. At present, the schools in general are reluctant to introduce methods which might reorient definitions of achievement. They must "staad pat" and make it through tomorrow.

The experimenters gained much respect for the administrators and supervisors who are in the schools. They experimenters are fully aware of the dedication of the teachers and administrators in the field, and they feel certain that, within a relatively short period of time, schools will be permitted to make curriculum changes which will permit realistic adjustments to the new situation in the schools.

Second, the experimenters were, of course, disappointed in the manner in which the second dimension of the semantic differential, SOCIAL CHARACTER, failed to achieve significant results. In an effort to overcome this limitation, the experimenters intend to readminister the twenty-adjectival differential to a second, more extensive sample of black subjects and to compute the results on the new BMDX72 computer program. When this retesting is done, the experimenters hope to have improved the methods by which the subjects are introduced to the differential and to rewrite the directions for the differential in language which more nearly communicates the objectives of the experiment and the operation of the differential.

A third limitation was the manner in which the college experimental cell operated during its scoring of the semantic differential. Possible reasons why this cell acted in a manner contrary to expectations have been discussed throughout this report, but none of the reasons suggested appears any more likely to explain the manner in which this cell reacted than any of the other reasons. If this cell had remained consistently obdurate to change in its scoring of the Likert scales, then its attribudes might have been more clearly attributed to sampling error. But, when, in using the Likert items, this cell began to operate largely in the predicted manner, the reasons for its response to the semantic differential remain clouded.

3. Implications for Further Study

There are so many implications for further study that each of the ones mentioned here will be given only a brief treatment.

1. As was pointed out in the introduction, the study needs to be replicated in a revised form, using subjects from other culturally disadvantaged and advantaged groups.

2. The extent to which blacks now think that they are bidialectal should be explored, These results could then be compared with the actual ability of blacks to switch dialects.

3. It would be valuable to know what agencies subjects of all groups think should assist them in becoming bidialectal, and specifically, it would be helpful to know whether subjects thought the schools should participate directly in bidialectal instruction.

4. The extent to which subjects understand the differences between formal English and informal English in the manner in which these labels are being used by the experimenters should be researched. This could be done by asking subjects to write a short paragraph in informal English and then to translate the paragraph into formal English, or, if the written English should prove a barrier, it could be done orally by selecting a random sample of subjects and asking them, in a brief interview, to give orally an example of informal English and a sample of formal English as they had understood the terms being used in the role playing process.

5. Instead of using scripts, certain subjects could be chosen whose ability to switch dialects was already highly developed, and these subjects could be used to stage a demonstration to the other students in the school from which the bidialectal subjects had been chosen. This would have the advantage of making the exercise more dramatic and more interesting to the subjects, but would provide less control of variables.

6. It should be determined how constant were the attitudes of blacks toward bidialectalism when some sort of commitment was required. The responses in this investigation were limited to pencil-and-paper tests which did not inconvenience the subjects nor cause them to make an overt act in favor of what they purported to be their opinions. The indications of a favorable attitude toward bidialectalism might disappear were the subjects required to make a commitment.

7. Correlations should be run between the opinions of subjects on one aspects of the study with their opinions on another aspect of the study, particularly correlations between items like the second and sixth Likert scales presented in this study.

8. The various order effects of the scripts need to be explored to determine if any particular order increases the motivating effects.

9. Foci for scripts other than those used here should be developed.

10. An investigation needs to be made of the correlation between the extent to which subjects think they can speak standard English and the extent to which, by some standard, they actually can speak standard English. The subjects in this experiment were generally pleased with the way they spoke, but it remains to be determined whether they were pleased because they thought that they spoke standard English or whether they were pleased because they thought they spoke Black English or whether they were pleased because they thought that they could speak both standard English and Black English.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahams, Roger D. POSITIVELY BLACK. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1970.

Bailey, Beryl L. JAMAICAN CREOLE SYNTAX. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Bailey, Beryl L. "Toward a New Perspective in Negro English Dialectology," AMERICAN SPEECH 40 (October, 1965), 171-77.

Baratz, Joan C. & Roger W. Shuy, eds. TEACHING BLACK CHILDREN TO READ. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Burling, Robbins. MAN'S MANY VOICES: LANGUAGE IN ITS CULTURAL CONTEXT. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.

Chesler, Mark & Robert Fox. ROLE-PLAYING METHODS IN THE CLASSROOM. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1966.

Clark, Kenneth B. "Educational Stimulation of Racially Disadvantaged Children," in EDUCATION IN DEPRESSED AREAS, Harry Passow, ed. New York: Teachers College Press, 1963.

Corsini, Raymond J. ROLEPLAYING IN PSYCHOTHERAPY: A MANUEL. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

Dillard, J. L. "The Creolist and the Study of Nonstandard Negro Dialect in the United States," in PIDGINIZATION AND CREOLIZATION OF LANGUAGES, Dell Hynes, ed. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Dillard, J. L. "The Writings of Herskovits and the Study of New World Negro Language," CARIBBEAN STUDIES 4, #2 (1964), 35-42.

Elms, Alan C. ROLE PLAYING, REWARD & ATTITUDE CHANGE. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1969.

Fasold, Ralph W. "Tense and the Form Be in Black English," LANGUAGE 45 (December, 1969), 763-77.

Fosket, John M. THE NORMATIVE WORLD OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, (1967).

Gordon, Gerald. ROLE THEORY & ILLNESS: A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE. New Haven, Connecticut: College and University Press, 1966.

Horn, Thomas D., ed. READING FOR THE DISADVANTAGED: PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTICALLY DIFFERENT LEARNERS. New York: Harcourt Brace & World, 1970.

Johnson, Kenneth R. "Standard English for the Non-Standard Child," paper prepared for the Second Annual Conference on Teaching English in the Southwest, held at Arizona State University, March, 1969.

Labov, William & Paul Cohen. "Systematic Relations of Standard and Non-Standard Rules in the Grammars of Negro Speakers," in PROJECT LITERARY REPORTS, #8. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967, 66-84.

Labov, William. THE STUDY OF NON-STANDARD ENGLISH. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Lindquist, E. F. DESIGN & ANALYSIS OF EXPERIMENTS IN PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1953.

McDavid, Raven Jr. "A Theory of Dialect," in LINGUISTICS & THE TEACHING OF STANDARD ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES OR DIALECTS. Report of the Twentieth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies, #22, James E. Alatis, ed. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970.

Pederson, Lee A. "Social Dialects & the Disadvantaged," in LANGUAGE PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED: REPORT OF THE NCTA TASK FORCE ON TEACHING ENGLISH TO THE DISADVANTAGED. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

Postman, Neil & Charles Weingartner. TEACHING AS A SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1969.

Shaftel, Fannie F. ROLE-PLAYING FOR SOCIAL VALUES: DECISION-MAKING IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1967.

Shuy, Roger W., ed. SOCIAL DIALECTS & LANGUAGE LEARNING. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

Sneider, James and Charles Osgood, eds. SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TECHNIQUES. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.

Stewart, William A. "Facts and Issues Concerning Black Dialects," THE ENGLISH RECORD (Special Anthology Issue, Spring, 1971.

Stewart, William A. NON-STANDARD SPEECH & THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

Williams, Frederick, ed. LANGUAGE & POVERTY: PERSPECTIVES ON A THEME. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1970.

Wolfram, Walter A. UNDERLYING REPRESENTATIONS IN BLACK ENGLISH PHONOLOGY. A paper presented to the Linguistic Society of America. Champaign, Illinois: July, 1969.

APPENDIX ONE

	APPARENT CHARACTER	SOCIAL CHARACTER		PERSONALITY VALUE		
VARIABLE	1	2	3	4	5	
1	-0.17979	-0.06107	0.78093	-0.10786	0.00126	relaxed-tense
2	-0.48748	-0.34858	0.16523	0.10923	0.00538	"together"-"tired"
3	0.30777	0.56547	-0.40918	0.27697	0.09375	unsociable-sociable
4	0.13496	-0.03020	-0.01261	-0.80487	0.22837	extrovert-introvert
5	0.37323	0.07744	-0.16731	0.61184	0.02371	uneasy-easy
6	0.65982	-0.16677	0.29203	0.09035	-0.17058	bull-headed-elastic
7	0.31797	0.13135	0.27430	0.58440	0.12842	self-centered-unselfish
8	0.68406	0.22217	-0.08743	0.31601	0.00932	strung out-cool
9	-0.72920	0.05055	0.04163	-0.29419	-0.25023	hep-cool
10	0.08449	0.62199	0.16524	-0.02613	0.35220	unlimited-limited
11	-0.18629	0.67362	0.10800	0.12149	-0.23154	recessive-dominant
12	0.21415	-0.08721	-0.22650	0.31175	-0.54889	**loner-mixer**
13	0.14798	0.13762	0.51500	0.12752	-0.04639	bold-cautious
14	0.10996	0.03771	0.24169	-0.05489	-0.72703	ambitious for himself-ambitious for others
15	-0.68221	-0.02684	0.11355	-0.18113	0.08028	outgoing-withdrawn
16	-0.72095	0.02745	0.11954	0.06041	0.31470	open-minded-closed minded
17	-0.70383	0.13894	0.01122	0.00336	0.41130	adaptable-rigid
18	-0.46777	-0.24579	0.35515	-0.32974	0.12734	comfortable-out-of-place
19	0.47085	0.41835	-0.26075	0.16573	-0.43781	uncertain-confident
20	0.67415	0.26938	0.27766	0.04993	-0.03789	"not with it"-"with it"

APPENDIX TWO

```
CORRELATION MATRIX

            1          2          3          4          5          6
  1    1.00000
  2    0.18855    1.00000
  3    0.33324    0.28095    1.00000
  4    0.01820   -0.02636    0.20669    1.00000
  5    0.20097    0.22195    0.27924    0.38987    1.00000
  6   -0.06649    0.24235    0.00117    0.01608    0.21888    1.00000
  7    0.00434    0.10172    0.28020    0.30153    0.20407    0.31207
  8    0.19565    0.26301    0.46082    0.11923    0.46158    0.43552
  9    0.17713    0.28700    0.25143    0.04103    0.40503    0.40377
 10    0.05467   -0.14452   -0.15231    0.00077   -0.16988    0.09179
 11   -0.05377    0.05869    0.14040    0.13904   -0.00445   -0.00812
 12    0.24247    0.09687    0.10002    0.25990    0.29178    0.25908
 13    0.12235   -0.14081    0.09650   -0.03455   -0.03245   -0.11732
 14   -0.15306   -0.01856   -0.14345    0.07156   -0.01848    0.13284
 15    0.13620    0.40983    0.20968    0.17479    0.41595    0.38196
 16    0.25305    0.33164    0.18711    0.07741    0.17030    0.47730
 17    0.07005    0.18551    0.13467    0.01331    0.25102    0.43463
 18    0.37397    0.25293    0.40875    0.13566    0.35534    0.12503
 19    0.31945    0.42202    0.48123    0.15530    0.34652    0.26242
 20   -0.03041    0.21371    0.26609    0.00346    0.29816    0.39581

           11         12         13         14         15         16
 11    1.00000
 12    0.07599    1.00000
 13    0.02433   -0.13163    1.00000
 14    0.03470    0.11177   -0.08306    1.00000
 15    0.07950    0.18580    0.07678    0.13275    1.00000
 16   -0.07359    0.29649   -0.07966    0.16599    0.50955    1.00000
 17   -0.15674    0.39858   -0.11090    0.27998    0.43553    0.63235
 18    0.06770    0.21527   -0.00978    0.11892    0.31458    0.37359
 19    0.12734    0.31880   -0.06318    0.24918    0.33671    0.42470
 20    0.04810    0.06949   -0.22305    0.19876    0.33086    0.39282
```

4	5	6	7	8	9	10
.00000						
.38987	1.00000					
.01608	0.21888	1.00000				
.30153	0.20407	0.31207	1.00000			
.11923	0.46158	0.43552	0.28700	1.00000		
.04103	0.40503	0.40377	0.40132	0.52906	1.00000	
.00077	-0.16988	0.09179	0.00147	-0.11809	-0.11392	1.00000
.13904	-0.00445	-0.00812	0.08652	0.14847	-0.10995	-0.21344
.25990	0.29178	0.25908	-0.03354	0.30367	0.16291	0.11030
.03455	-0.03245	-0.11732	-0.25412	-0.11020	-0.06298	0.16235
.07156	-0.01848	0.13284	0.06024	-0.03012	-0.00230	0.16811
.17479	0.41595	0.38196	0.18211	0.54768	0.57223	-0.03811
.07741	0.17030	0.47730	0.13733	0.43241	0.35304	-0.02102
.01331	0.25102	0.43463	0.13575	0.43763	0.35611	0.06920
.13566	0.35534	0.12503	0.40568	0.46981	0.40490	-0.03906
.15530	0.34652	0.26242	0.25991	0.38050	0.29145	-0.07336
.00346	0.29816	0.39581	0.30789	0.49190	0.40224	-0.21461

14	15	16	17	18	19	20
.00000						
.13275	1.00000					
.16599	0.50955	1.00000				
.27998	0.43553	0.63235	1.00000			
.11892	0.31458	0.37359	0.40654	1.00000		
.24918	0.33671	0.42470	0.41010	0.52081	1.00000	
.19876	0.33086	0.39282	0.43061	0.28078	0.35821	1.00000

APPENDIX THREE

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL FOR DIALECTS

____
(school)

____
(name)

sex ( )male
( )female

( ) 9th grade
( ) 10th grade
( ) 11th grade
( ) 12th grade
( ) college freshman
( ) other ______________________
(specify)

What do you think of a person who has the ability to speak both
a formal English dialect
AND
an informal English dialect?

Describe such a person on the scale below. On the first scale, for example, if you thought that one of your friends who had the ability to speak both formal English dialect and an informal English dialect was extremely simple, you would check the blank shown below:

SIMPLE:_X_:____:____:____:____:____:____:COMPLEX

If you thought that such a friend who could speak two dialects was very simple but not extremely so, you would check the second blank:

SIMPLE:____:_X_:____:____:____:____:____:COMPLEX

If rather simple, the third blank. If you thought such a person was extremely complex, you would check the seventh blank:

SIMPLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:_X_:COMPLEX

Very complex but not extremely so, the sixth blank; if rather complex, the fifth blank.

If you thought such a person was evenly balanced between simple and complex, or if you couldn't decide, or if you thought neither term applied to such a person in any way, then you would check the middle or fourth blank.

Only one position can be checked on each scale, but please complete every item.

SIMPLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:COMPLEX
RELAXED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:TENSE
"TOGETHER":____:____:____:____:____:____:____:"TIRED"
UNSOCIABLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:SOCIABLE
EXTROVERT:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:

If rather simple, the third blank. If you thought such a person was extremely complex, you would check the seventh blank:

SIMPLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:_X_:COMPLEX

Very complex but not extremely so, the sixth blank; if rather complex, the fifth blank.

If you thought such a person was evenly balanced between simple and complex, or if you couldn't decide, or if you thought neither term applied to such a person in any way, then you would check the middle or fourth blank.

Only one position can be checked on each scale, but please complete every item.

SIMPLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:COMPLEX
RELAXED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:TENSE
"TOGETHER":____:____:____:____:____:____:____:"TIRED"
UNSOCIABLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:SOCIABLE
EXTROVERT:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:INTROVERT
UNEASY:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:EASY
BULL-HEADED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:ELASTIC
SELF-CENTERED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:UNSELFISH
STRUNG OUT:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:COOL
HEP:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:SQUARE
UNLIMITED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:LIMITED
RECESSIVE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:DOMINANT
LONER:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:MIXER
BOLD:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:CAUTIOUS
AMBITIOUS FOR HIMSELF:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:AMBITIOUS FOR OTHERS
OUTGOING:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:WITHDRAWN
OPEN-MINDED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:CLOSED-MINDED
ADAPTABLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:RIGID
COMFORTABLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:OUT-OF-PLACE
UNCERTAIN:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:CONFIDENT
"NOT WITH IT":____:____:____:____:____:____:____:"WITH IT"

How well did you understand what you have just done in marking the adjectives?

( )understood very well what to do
( )understood somewhat what to do
( )understood a little what to do
( )understood very little what to do
( )understood not at all what to do

APPENDIX FOUR

N. C. C. U. **SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL FOR DIALECTS** UNC-CH

(revised)

____
(school)

sex ( )male
( )female

____
(name)

( ) 9th grade
( ) 10th grade
( ) 11th grade
( ) 12th grade
( ) college freshman
( ) other ____________
(specify)

GROUP LETTER NUMBER ____________________
A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, B2,etc. or KONTROL

What do you think of a person who has the ability to speak at least two ways? This person can speak a formal English dialect (or standard English) and at least one informal English dialect (Appalachian or hill-billy English; Western or cow-boy; white Piedmont North Carolina dialect; black Piedmont North Carolina dialect; Big-city dialect or Brooklynese, etc.) Such a person probably can speak the dialect he grew up with plus the formal English that is generally taught in school.

We want you to use the adjectives below to describe a person who can speak both his school English and the sort of informal English he might use with his friends and family.

For example, look at the first set of adjectives below, SIMPLE and COMPLEX. If you thought that one of your friends who could speak both a formal-or-school English and an informal-or-friends*family English was an extremely simple person, you would check the blank shown below:

SIMPLE:__X__:____:____:____:____:____:____:COMPLEX

If you thought that your friend who could speak his two dialects was very simple but not extremely so, you would check the second blank from the left:

SIMPLE:____:__X__:____:____:____:____:____:COMPLEX

If rather simple, the third blank. If you thought such a person was extremely complex, you would check the seventh blank from the left:

SIMPLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:__X__:COMPLEX

If you thought that the person was very complex but not extremely so, you would check the sixth blank; if rather complex, the fifth blank.

If you thought that such a person was evenly balanced between simple and complex, or---if you couldn't decide what he was, or---if you thought neither SIMPLE or COMPLEX were words which described a person who could speak two dialects, then you would check the middle or fourth blank.

CHECK ONLY ONE POSITION ON EACH SCALE----but please complete every item.

SIMPLE:____:____:____:____:____:____: X :COMPLEX

If you thought that the person was very complex but not extremely so, you would check the sixth blank; if rather complex, the fifth blank.

If you thought that such a person was evenly balanced between simple and complex, or---if you couldn't decide what he was, or---if you thought neither SIMPLE or COMPLEX were words which described a person who could speak two dialects, then you would check the middle or fourth blank.

CHECK ONLY ONE POSITION ON EACH SCALE----but please complete every item.

SIMPLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:COMPLEX
OPEN-MINDED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:CLOSED-MINDED
TIRED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:ENERGETIC
COMFORTABLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:UNCOMFORTABLE
UNCERTAIN:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:CONFIDENT
STRUNG OUT:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:COOL
UNLIMITED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:LIMITED
SOCIABLE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:UNSOCIABLE
WITHDRAWN:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:OUTGOING
SQUARE:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:HIP (HEP)
AMBITIOUS FOR OTHERS:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:AMBITIOUS FOR HIMSEL
EASY:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:UNEASY
RELAXED:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:TENSE
FOLLOWER:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:LEADER
CAUTIOUS:____:____:____:____:____:____:____:BOLD
"WITH IT":____:____:____:____:____:____:____:"NOT WITH IT"

How well did you understand what you have just done in marking these adjectives to describe a person who can speak both formal and informal English?

( ) understood very well what to do
( ) understood well what to do
( ) understood somewhat what to do
( ) understood a little what to do
( ) understood very little what to do

APPENDIX FOUR

____
(school)

____
(name)

sex( )male
( )female

( ) 9th grade
( ) 10th grade
( ) 11th grade
( ) 12th grade
( ) college freshman
( ) other ______________________
(specify)

Please give us the following information:

1. Do you think you will be going to college?
   - ( )definitely yes
   - ( )probably so
   - ( )maybe
   - ( )probably not
   - ( )definitely not

2. What are the chances that you will be doing social work when you get out of school?
   - ( ) definitely will do social work
   - ( ) probably will do social work
   - ( ) may do social work
   - ( ) probably will not do social work
   - ( ) definitely will not do social work

3. With whom did you identify most in the scripts? What person did you think was the most like you or like you would like to become?
   - ( ) Smith in Script #1 who ran long distances
   - ( ) Smith in Script #2 who ran short distances
   - ( ) Jones in Script #3 who wanted to learn Appalachian dialect
   - ( ) Jones in Script #4 who knew formal English

4. What is your present attitude toward the way you sound when you speak?
   - ( ) I am not at all pleased with the way I speak
   - ( ) I am somewhat displeased with the way I speak
   - ( ) I have not given much attention to tht ewy I speak
   - ( ) I am relatively pleased with the way I speak
   - ( ) I am very pleased with the way I speak

5. How interested are you in being able to speak more than one way, so that you could use informal English dialect in informal situations and formal English dialect in formal situation--an informal situation would be social conversation with your friends at school and a formal situation would be the way you would speak during most job interviews?
   - ( ) I am not at all interested in learning how to talk any way but the way I do
   - ( ) I am a little interested in learning how to speak formally and informally
   - ( ) I am somewhat interested in learning how to speak formally and informally
   - ( ) I am enthusiastic about learning how to speak formally and informally
   - ( ) I am highly enthusiastic about learning how to speak formally and informally

4. What is your present attitude toward the way you sound when you speak?

( ) I am not at all pleased with the way I speak
( ) I am somewhat displeased with the way I speak
( ) I have not given much attention to tht ewy I speak
( ) I am relatively pleased with the way I speak
( ) I am very pleased with the way I speak

5. How interested are you in being able to speak more than one way, so that you could use informal English dialect in informal situations and formal English dialect in formal situation--an informal situation would be social conversation with your friends at school and a formal situation would be the way you would speak during most job interviews?

( ) I am not at all interested in learning how to talk any way but the way I do
( ) I am a little interested in learning how to speak formally and informally
( ) I am somewhat interested in learning how to speak formally and informally
( ) I am enthusiastic about learning how to speak formally and informally
( ) I am highly enthusiastic about learning how to speak formally and informally

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Encircle one number in each line below.

EVERYONE SHOULD TRY TO SPEAK CORRECT ENGLISH AT ALL TIMES.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
strongly disagree				undecided				strongly agree

INFORMAL ENGLISH (dialectical English or English speak with an accent) SOMETIMES COMMUNICATES BETTER IN SOME SITUATIONS THAN DOES FORMAL ENGLISH.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
strongly disagree				undecided				strongly agree

PEOPLE WHO LEARN TO SPEAK TWO OR MORE DIALECTS OF THEIR OWN LANGUAGE ARE BEING TRUE TO THEMSELVES.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
strongly disagree				undecided				strongly agree

STUDENTS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO BE PROUD OF SPEAKING THEIR OWN DIALECT WHILE, AT THE SAME TIME, THEY LEARN STANDARD ENGLISH ALONG SIDE OF IT.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
strongly disagree				undecided				strongly agree

APPENDIX FIVE

	APPARENT CHARACTER	SOCIAL CHARACTER		PERSONALITY VALUE		
VARIABLE	1	2	3	4	5	
1	0.03956	0.16741	0.77747	0.01440	0.02421	relaxed-tense
2	0.40563	-0.32538	0.36974	-0.02381	0.20269	"together"-"tired"
3	0.17867	-0.31369	0.63259	0.12421	-0.25520	unsociable-sociable
4	-0.07982	0.00092	0.08710	-0.18121	-0.82087	extrovert-introvert
5	0.39824	-0.01770	0.29868	0.04943	-0.53657	uneasy-easy
6	0.70271	0.06607	-0.17503	-0.22678	-0.06922	bull-headed-elastic
7	0.38459	-0.22206	-0.10150	0.04956	-0.57839	self-centered-unselfish
8	0.66669	-0.16793	0.30949	-0.01048	-0.25415	strung out-cool
9	0.76649	0.03947	0.15102	0.19285	-0.21043	hep-cool
10	-0.08829	0.67161	-0.04430	-0.31092	-0.05913	unlimited-limited
11	-0.22485	-0.59862	0.11294	-0.15135	-0.19527	recessive-dominant
12	0.14544	0.15668	0.29977	-0.54825	-0.24608	loner-mixer
13	-0.19422	0.40138	0.35744	0.18108	0.08052	bold-cautious
14	0.06393	-0.07270	-0.20844	-0.73221	-0.00373	ambitious for himself-ambitious for others
15	0.67147	0.02892	0.24974	-0.06933	-0.13313	outgoing-withdrawn
16	0.63872	0.02720	0.26804	-0.38518	0.13746	open-minded-closed-minded
17	0.64242	0.11124	0.12547	-0.50117	0.06209	adaptable-rigid
18	0.37516	-0.13360	0.52463	-0.17889	-0.24917	comfortable-out-of-place
19	0.33409	-0.31520	0.53594	-0.42900	-0.10302	uncertain-confident
20	0.65041	-0.39128	-0.05985	-0.12583	-0.04279	"not with it"-"with it"

APPENDIX SIX

N.C.C.U.

ROLE PLAYING SCRIPT #1

UNC-CH

#1 SWOPE: You looking fer thuh Vista Office?

#2 JONES: Yes. I want to apply to work in a ghetto area. I'm
Alice Jones.
Arvin Jones.
I have a ten o'clock appointment.

SWOPE: That's right. Dr. Phelps 'n Dr. Thomas will be ready in uh minute.

JONES: That's fine. I think I'm uh few minutes early anyway.

#3 PHELPS: (coming in from the other room) You're
Miss Jones?
Mister Jones?

JONES: Yes I am.

PHELPS: Go right into thuh confrence room--on yer right--'an introduce yourself tuh Dr. Thomas. Where's thuh Jones file?

SWOPE: It's already in there on thuh table, Dr. Phelps.

PHELPS: Good--that's fine. (goes into conference room). Well now, you've had your physical, I see, an' that wuz fine, an' yer papers here, they're all in order.

JONES: I think my file's complete.

#4 THOMAS: Thuh real purpose of this interview is tuh get some additional information. In Vista we work in rough areas with many differen types of people an' we have tuh communicate with all uvum. Tell me, are you proud of bein' black?

JONES: (somewhat surprised) Well...yes. Yes I am.

PHELPS: I see here that yer father zuh preacher an' yer mother zuh school teacher. Are they proud of bein' black?

JONES: Well, perhaps not as much...well, they're older 'n all that. But I think they're changing...getting more comfortable about being black.

THOMAS: That's encouragin'. Now I wantuh asT chou about black speech. You're goin' tuh be workin' in ghetto areas, you know. Some people these days want tuh pretend black dialek doesn't exis.

PHELPS: I guess that's bekuz blacks have been told they spoke uh dialek whereas whites spoke standard English. But that isn't true. Everyone in thuh world speaks some dialek, 'n manyuv us speak two er three. For example, I speak Southern white Piedmont dialek an', I hope, formal English dialek.

THOMAS:
Alice,
Arvin,
can you still use yer black dialek?

JONES: I sure can.

PHELPS: Well, then, let's give it uh try. I wantchuh tuh answer thuh rest uv my questions in Southern black Piedmont dialek. OK?

JONES: What's I got to lose?

goin' tuh be workin' in ghetto areas, you know. Some people these days want tuh pretend black dialek doesn't exis.

PHELPS:I guess that's bekuz blacks have been told they spoke uh dialek whereas whites spoke standard English. But that isn't true. Everyone in thuh world speaks some dialek,'n manyuv us speak two er three. For example, I speak Southern white Piedmont dialek an', I hope, formal English dialek.

THOMAS: Alice, Arvin, can you still use yer black dialek?

JONES: I sure can.

PHELPS:Well, then, let's give it uh try. I wantchuh tuh answer thuh rest uv my questions in Southern black Piedmont dialek. OK?

JONES: What's I got to lose?

THOMAS:Howdjuh get intrested in Vista?

JONES: I aKs my girl friend do she know how to find out 'bout Vista,'cause I seed yo ads on Tee-Vee, an' Belinda,she say dat de office is on Fouf Street, so I come an' got de papers an' all dat stuff you gives out,and here I is.

PHELPS:Vista's hard work. Are you prepared tuh work hard?

JONES: Listen,baby,my name ain't Jone fer nutin'. My father, he work hard all his life. I start wurkin' in de dime store pushin' uh broom when I was fo'teen years old, ater school. Ain't nutin I can't do if I wants to.

THOMAS:Right on, Miss Jones, Mr. Jones, right on! I see you can handle your dialek nicely. As we would say in my Appalachian dialek, "Hit hopes if'n our Vister Workers kin speak bothuh formal English dialek 'n least ways one informal dialek."

PHELPS:Our whites have to speak some white dialek--like Dr. Thomas' North Carolina Appalachian dialek.

JONES: I'd like to learn Appalachian dialek when I have time.

PHELPS:Sure. Well thank's very much. You'll hear from us shortly.

JONES: Thanks again. Good-bye, Dr. Pehlps. So long, Dr. Thomas.

SWOPE: We hope to see you soon, Miss Jones. Mister Jones. (PAUSE WHILE JONES LEAVES) Well, Dr. Phelps, whatdjew 'n Dr. Thomas think uv Jones as uh prospect?

THOMAS:Thuh papers look good, 'n so are thuh recommendations. But that's true uh lots uh people. What I liked best was thuh attitude expressed.

PHELPS:You mean Jones was--together? Well, I agree.

SWOPE: I could hear mostuh thuh interview. Jones certainly handles both formal English dialek 'n black English dialek. I liked that.

PHELPS:An' seemed proud uvum both. That's thuh kind we need. Put Jones' file over there fer last minute checking 'n let me know what thuh next person comes in.

ROLE PLAYING SCRIPT #2

SWOPE: You looking fer thuh Vista Office?

JONES: Yes, I want to apply to work in a ghetto area. I'm Alice Jones. / Arvin Jones. I have a ten o'clock appointment.

SWOPE: That's right. Dr. Phelps 'n Dr. Thomas will be ready in uh minute.

JONES: That's fine. I think I'm uh few minutes early anyway.

PHELPS:(coming in from the other room) You're Miss Jones? / Mister Jones?

JONES: Yes I am.

PHELPS:Go right into thuh confrence room--on yer right--'an introduce yourself tuh Dr. Thomas. Where's thuh Jones file?

SWOPE: It's already in there on thuh table, Dr. Phelps.

PHELPS:Good--that's fine. (goes into conference room). Well now,you've had your physical,I see,an' that quz fine,an' yer papers here,they're all in order.

JONES: I think my file's complete.

THOMAS:Thuh real purpose of this interview is tuh get some additional information. In Vista we work in rough areas with many differen types of people an' we have tuh communicate with all uvum. Tell me,are you proud of bein' black?

JONES: (somewhat surprised) Well...yes. Yes I am.

PHELPS:I see here that yer father zuh preacher an' yer mother zuh school teacher. Are they proud of bein' black?

JONES: Well,perhaps not as much...well, they're older 'n all that. It's very difficult for older people to change their ways of thinking.

THOMAS:Yes,I know. Now I wantuh asT chou about black speech. You're goin' tuh be workin' in ghetto areas, you know. Some people these days want tuh pretend black dialek doesn't exis.

PHELPS:I guess that's bekuz blacks have been told they spoke a dialek whereas whites spoke standard English. But that isn't true. Everyone in thuh world speaks some dialek,'n manyuv us speak two er three. Fer example, I speak Southern white Piedmont dialek an', I hope, formal English dialek.

THOMAS:Alice, / Arvin, can you still use yer black dialek?

JONES: I suppose so, but I prefer to speak good English.

PHELPS:Well, then, let's give it uh try. I wanchuh tuh answer thuh rest uv my questions in Southern black Piedmont dialek. OK?

JONES: Well, all right,but I fail to see what that has to do with this interview.

THOMAS:Howdjuh get intrested in Vista?

be workin' in ghetto areas, you know. Some people
pretend black dialek doesn't exis.

PHELPS: I guess that's bekuz blacks have been told they spoke a dialek whereas whites spoke standard English. But that isn't true. Everyone in thuh world speaks some dialek,'n manyuv us speak two er three. Fer example, I speak Southern white Piedmont dialek an', I hope, formal English dialek.

THOMAS: Alice,
Arvin,
can you still use yer black dialek?

JONES: I suppose so, but I prefer to speak good English.

PHELPS: Well, then, let's give it uh try. I wanchuh tuh answer thuh rest uv my questions in Southern black Piedmont dialek. OK?

JONES: Well, all right,but I fail to see what that has to do with this interview.

THOMAS: Howdjuh get intrested in Vista?

JONES: I asked my friend if she knew about Vista,because I had heard your ads on television, and Belinda, my girl friend,she said that the office was on Fourth Street, so I came to get your papers an' thuh other things, an' here I am.

PHELPS: Vista's hard work. Are you prepared tuh work hard?

JONES: Well, of course, I certainly am. My father has worked hard all his life. I began working in a department store cleaning up when I was fourteen years old, after school. I can do any amount of work I want to.

THOMAS: Well, Miss Jones,
Mister Jones,
I see you prefer tuh stick pretty close tuh formal English dialek. But it's an asset if our Vista workers can speak both formal English dialek an' at least one informal English dialek.

PHELPS: Our whites have to speak some white dialek...like Dr. Thomas' North Carolina Appalachian dialek.

JONES: I suppose so, but I prefer always to speak as an educated person.

PHELPS: Sure. Well, thanks very much. You'll hear from us shortly.

JONES: Thank you again. Good-bye, Dr. Phelps. Good-bye. Dr. Thomas.

SWOPE: We hope to see you soon, Miss Jones.
Mister Jones.
(PAUSE WHILE JONES LEAVES) Well, Dr. Phelps, whatdjew n' Dr. Thomas think uv Jones as uh prospect?

THOMAS: Thuh papers look good,'n so are thuh recommendations. But that's true uh lots us people. But there was somethin' about thuh attitude...

PHELPS: You mean Miss Jones was up tight about bein' black. Well, I agree.

SWOPE: I could hear mostuh thuh interview. If Jones can use black dialek,
he
she
certainly doesn't want to. But Jones' formal English is very good.

PHELPS: And for some jobs that would be just great, and even then I wonder about the ability to communite with some people. But for Vista--well, put the file over there an' I'll put "questionable" on thuh interview rating. We may go back over thuh file later. An' send in thuh next applicant.

N.C.C.U. **ROLE PLAYING SCRIPT #3** UNC-CH

MARKS: 'Morning. I'm Miss Marks,
Mister Marks, Dr. Hathaway's secretary.

SMITH: I'm Ruth Smith.
Kenneth Smith. I got un uh pointment wif Mister Hafaway.

MARKS: What's yer name again please?

SMITH: Ruth Smith.
Kenneth Smith.

MARKS: Oh yes,Dr. Hathaway's expecting you. Dr. Thomas uz in there with "im. Go right in. Dr. Hathaway, this'uz Ruth Smith
Kenneth Smith who'z applying for admission to college fer next fall.

HATHAWAY:Good mornin', Miss Smith
Mister Smith. (CALLING TO OUTER OFFICE) Miss Marks,
Mister Marks, I'll call yuh if I needjih. Have seats everybody.

THOMAS: Thuh purpose of these interviews is tuh get information we can't get through tests. Now I notice here in yer essay thatchew say you're particularly intrested in this school. I wanna ass you what gotchuh intrested in us.

SMITH: Well now, at thuh present time, my ambitious are to be a chemistry teacher. Our high school chemistry teacher,Mister Feaduhson, aKst me to apply here.

HATHAWAY:I see. Well, have yuh heard any specific ruhports uhbout chemistry here?

SMITH: Mister Feaduhson, he say you got thuh bes chemistry department round here, an' I'm sure you got some fine teachers. I seen a picture of one of them in uh magazine a little while back. This professor, they say he is one of thuh ten bes in thuh country.

THOMAS: Yeah, we're very proud uv our reputation in chemistry. I see here on your application that you've been active on yer school newspaper. Have yuh found that yer work on thuh paper helps you in yer study uv English?

SMITH: Yeah, "cause my grades on English themes is higher now than they used tuh be. I thank this is 'cause I had to learn to say things clearly, in short sentences, wifout skippin' 'round.

HATHAWAY:D'jih spen your time after school on yer newspaper work?

SMITH: I spend a lotta time on thuh paper, but I play on thuh track team too.

THOMAS: What's yer specialty?

SMITH: Short run. I'm good at short run.

HATHAWAY:Duh yuh think you'd be intrested in track in college?

SMITH: Yeah, I thank so. I hope I know by spring if I can get time out from study to short run.

good. 'n I like thuh idea that you've been active

THOMAS: Yeah, we're very proud uv our reputation in chemistry. I see [illegible] on your application that you've been active on yer school newspaper. Have yuh found that yer work on thuh paper helps you in yer study uv English?

SMITH: Yeah, "cause my grades on English themes is higher now than they used tuh be. I thank this is 'cause I had to learn to say things clearly, in short sentences, wifout skippin' 'round.

HATHAWAY: D'jih spen your time after school on yer newspaper work?

SMITH: I spend a lotta time on thuh paper, but I play on thuh track team too.

THOMAS: What's yer specialty?

SMITH: Short run. I'm good at short run.

HATHAWAY: Duh yuh think you'd be intrested in track in college?

SMITH: Yeah, I thank so. I hope I know by spring if I can get time out from study to short run.

THOMAS: Yer school record's very good, 'n I like thuh idea that you've been active both in sports 'n on thuh newspaper. We'll make our decision about yer admission socn. You'll be hearin' from us.

SMITH: I sure do thank you, Doctor Thomas. I 'preciate hearin' from you.

HATHAWAY: Thanks fer comin' in, Miss Smith
Mister Smith. Good-bye. (PAUSE WHILE SMITH LEAVES)

THOMAS: Miss Marks,
Mister Marks, please bring in thuh Smith file so we kun enter our evaluation uv thuh interview.

MARKS: Well, I'm curious tuh know what you thought uv thuh applicant.

HATHAWAY: Frankly, I'm puzzled. Thuh school record's good...but I don't know just what tuh say. It's fine tuh keep yer dialek--I'm all fer that, but I wish there'd been less uv it in thuh interview. This iz uh rather formal meetin', 'n I suppose some people 'ud disagree with me, but I think Smith should uh been usin' formal English dialek during this interview.

MARKS: But I've heard you say that black people should be proud of their dialek.

HATHAWAY: Yes I have, 'n I'm proud uv my own Appalachian dialek too. I grew up way back in thuh hills. But I've learned when tuh use it an' when not tuh.

MARKS: Excuse me, Dr. Hathaway, but isn't that uh little narrow-minded?

HATHAWAY: Perhaps so, but that's thuh way I feel. A person should be able to switch dialeks when he wanstuh.

MARKS: Well, I did have some trouble gettin' his name. What'll I do with thuh file?

HATHAWAY: I'll mark it--well, I'll put "questionable" on thuh interview rating. Put thuh file over there with those we may go back over later, 'n send in thuh next applicant.

N.C.C.U. **ROLE PLAYING SCRIPT #4** UNC-CH

MARKS: 'Morning. I'm Miss Marks, / Mister Marks, Dr. Hathaway's secretary.

SMITH: I'm Ruth Smith. / Kenneth Smith. I have an appointment with Dr. Hathaway.

MARKS: Oh yes. Go right in. Dr. Hathaway's expecting yuh. Dr. Thomas is in there with'im. Dr. Hathaway, this 'uz Ruth Smith / Kenneth Smith who's applying fer admission fer next fall.

HATHAWAY: Good mornin', Miss Smith. / Mister Smith. (CALLING TO OUTER OFFICE) Miss Marks, / Mister Marks, I'll call you if I needjuh. Have seats, everybody.

THOMAS: Thuh purpose of these interviews is tuh get information we can't get through tests. Now I notice here in yer essay thatchew say you're particularly intrested in this school. I wanna ass you what gotchuh intrested in us.

SMITH: Well, at present,my ambition is to become uh chemistry teacher. Our high school chemistry teacher,Mister Fatherton,asked me to apply here.

HATHAWAY: I see. Well, have yuh heard any specific reports about chemistry here?

SMITH: Mister Featherton said you had thuh best chemistry department in this area, and I know you have some fine teachers. I saw uh picture of one of them in Time Magazine a little while ago. This professor was supposed to be one of thuh ten best in thuh country.

THOMAS: Yeah, we're very proud uv our reputation in chemistry. I see here on your application that you've been active on yer school newspaper. Have yuh found that yer work on thuh paper helps you in yer study uv English?

SMITH: Yes it does, because my grades on English themes are higher now than they used to be. I think this is becuz I had to learn to say things clearly, in short sentences, without ramblin' around.

HATHAWAY: Djih spen your time after school on yer newspaper work?

SMITH: I spend lots of time on thuh paper, but I am also on the track team.

THOMAS: What's yer specialty?

SMITH: I'm a sprinter--we call it "short run". I'm a good sprinter.

HATHAWAY: Duh yuh think you'd be intrested in track in college?

SMITH: Yes, I think so. I hope tuh know by spring if I can afford tuh take time used to be. I think this is becuz I had to learn to say things clearly, in short sentences, without ramblin' around.

HATHAWAY: Djih spen your time after school on yer newspaper work?

SMITH: I spend lots of time on thuh paper, but I am also on the track team.

THOMAS: What's yer specialty?

SMITH: I'm a sprinter--we call it "short run". I'm a good sprinter.

HATHAWAY: Duh yuh think you'd be intrested in track in college?

SMITH: Yes, I think so. I hope tuh know by spring if I can afford tuh take time out from my studies tuh sprint.

THOMAS: Yer school recofd's very good, 'n I like thuh idea that you've been active both in sports 'n on thuh newspaper. We'll make our decision about yer admission soon. You'll be hearin' from us.

SMITH: I certainly do thank you, Dr. Thomas. I'll appreciate hearing from you.

HATHAWAY: Thanks fer comin' in, Miss Smith.
Mister Smith. Good-bye. (PAUSE WHILE SMITH LEAVES)

THOMAS: Miss Marks,
Mister Marks, please bring in thuh Smith file so we kun enter our evaluation uv thuh interview.

MARKS: Well, I'm curious tuh know what you thought uh thuh applicant.

HATHAWAY: Frankly, I'm pleased. Thuh school record's good..an' I wuz impressed. That wuz a good job of communication. There was evidence that Smith's kept uh dialek--I'm all fer that--you noticed that comment about "sprinting" an' "short run". But this quz uh fairly formal situation, an' whether I'm right or not, I think Smith should uh been usin' formal English dialek during this interview.

MARKS: But I've heard you say that black people should be proud of their dialek.

HATHAWAY: Yes I have, 'n I'm proud uv my own Appalachian dialek too. I grew up way back in thuh hills. But I've learned when tuh use it an' when not tuh.

MARKS: Excuse me, Dr. Hathaway, but isn't that uh little narrow minded?

HATHAWAY: Perhaps so, but we dress diffrent ways for diffrent occasions. Why shouldn't we adapt our speech just as we adapt our dress. I'm glad to see a person be able to switch dialeks when he wanstuh.

MARKS: Well, as long as you're not objecting to keeping uh dialek.

HATHAWAY: Not uh tall. He should. But he can tone it up an' down, dependin'. Seems tuh me that's thuh kind uv person we need. Put his file over there for last minute checkin' 'n let me know when thuh next person comes in.

APPENDIX SEVEN

N.C.C.U. **ROLE PLAYING SCRIPT #1** UNC-CH

(revised)

Miss Marks
#1MARKS: Good morning. I'm Mister Marks, Dr. Hall's secretary.

Ruth Smith.
#2SMITH: I'm Kenneth Smith.

MARKS: Oh yes. Go right in. Dr. Hall and Dr. Thomas are expecting you. Dr. Hall,
Ruth Smith
this is Kenneth Smith who's applying for admission to college next fall.

#3HALL: Good morning. Please sit down.

#4THOMAS: The purpose of these interviews is to get information we cannot get on tests. You say in your essay that you're particularly interested in this school. What got you interested in us?

SMITH: Well, I wanna teach--chimestry, I guess. Our high school chem teacher, Mr. Featherton, he said this-uz thuh bes' place.

HALL: I see. Well,have you heard any specific reports about chemistry here?

SMITH: Mr. Featherton hepped me. He said you'all got thuh bes' chem department in thishere area, an' I know you'all sure got some real fine teachers. I seed a picture uh one uh them in a magazine onct. Thishere professor, they say he's a big shot, one uh thuh ten bes' in thuh country.

THOMAS: Yes, we're very proud of our reputation in chemistry. I see that you've been active on your school paper. Have you found that your work on the paper helps you in your study of English?

SMITH: Yeah, 'cause my grades done improved, 'cause I hadda learn tuh say things clearly without messin' round.

HALL: Did you spend your time after school on newspaper work?

SMITH: I spend uh lotta time on thuh paper, hits interestin', but I also run on the track team. I'm a long distance runner. Us whites do good runnin' long distances. Our team's great. Got good sprinters too.

HALL: Do you think you'd be interested in track in college?

SMITH: Yeah, if I kin git time out from my studies. I oughter know that by spring.

THOMAS: Your school record is very good, and I like the fact that you've been active in sports and on the paper. We'll make our decision about your

on the track team. I'm a long distance runner. Us whites do good runnin' long distances. Our team's great. Got good sprinters too.

HALL: Do you think you'd be interested in track in college?

SMITH: Yeah, if I kin git time out from my studies. I oughter know that by spring.

THOMAS: Your school record is very good, and I like the fact that you've been active in sports and on the paper. We'll make our decision about your admission soon. You'll be hearing from us.

SMITH: Sure do thank you, Dr. Thomas.

HALL: Thanks for coming in, Miss Smith.
Mister Smith. Good-bye. (PAUSE WHILE SMITH LEAVES)

THOMAS: Marks, bring in the Smith file so we can enter the evaluation on the interview.

MARKS: I'm curious to know what you thought of the applicant.

HALL: Frankly, I'm puzzled. The school record's good, but I don't know just what to say. He evidently comes from a family around here somewhere, and it's fine to keep your white dialect, I'm all for that. But I wish there has been less of it in this interview. This was a rather formal meeting and I think he should have been able to speak formal English in talking with us.

MARKS: But I've heard you say that people should be proud of their dialects.

HALL: Yes, I have, and I'm proud of my own Appalachian dialect. I grew up way back in the hills.But I've learned when to use it and when not to use it.

MARKS: Excuse me, Dr. Hall, but isn't that being a little narrow minded. People should be able to talk just as they please.

THOMAS: If they are willing to take the consequences. Sure! But how many people are willing to lose jobs and places in college because they can't adjust the way they talk.

MARKS: I guess so. What shall I do with the file?

HALL: I'll makr it--well, I'll put "questionable" on the interview rating. Put the file over there with those we may go back over later, and send in the next applicant.

N.C.C.U. UNC-CH

ROLE PLAYING SCRIPT #2
(revised)

#4MARKS: Good morning. I'm Miss Marks, / Mister Marks, Dr. Hall-s secretary.

#1SMITH: I'm Ruth Smith. / Kenneth Smith.

MARKS: Oh yes, go right in. Dr. Hall and Dr. Thomas are expecting you. Dr. Hall, this is Ruth Smith / Kenneth Smith who's applying for admission to college next fall.

#2HALL: Good morning. Please sit down.

#3THOMAS: The purpose of these interviews is to get information we cannot get on tests. You say in your essay that you're particularly interested in this school. What got you interested in us?

SMITH: Well, at present, my ambition is to become a chemistry teacher. Our high school chemistry teacher, Mister Featherton, asked me to apply here.

HALL: I see. Well, have you heard any specific reports about chemistry here?

SMITH: Mister Featherton said you had the best chemistry department in this area, and I know you have some fine teachers. I saw a picture of one of them in Time Magazine a little while ago. This professor was supposed to be one of the ten best in the country.

THOMAS: Yes, we're very proud of our reputation in chemistry. I see that you've been active on your school paper. Have you found that your work on the paper helps you in your study of English?

SMITH: Yes it does, because my grades on English themes are higher now than they used to be. I think this is because I had to learn to say things clearly, in short sentences, without ramblinb around.

HALL: Did you spend your time after school on newspaper work?

SMITH: I spend a lot of time on the paper, but I am also on the track team. I'm a sprinter--we blacks call it "short run". I'm a good sprinter.

HALL: Do you think you'd be interested in track in college?

SMITH: Yes, I think so. I'll know by spring if I can afford the time.

active in sports and on the paper. We'll make our decision about your

been active on your school paper. Have you found that your work on the paper helps you in your study of English?

SMITH: Yes it does, because my grades on English themes are higher now than they used to be. I think this is because I had to learn to say things clearly, in short sentences, without ramblinb around.

HALL: Did you spend your time after school on newspaper work?

SMITH: I spend a lot of time on the paper, but I am also on the track team. I'm a sprinter--we blacks call it "short run". I'm a good sprinter.

HALL: Do you think you'd be interested in track in college?

SMITH: Yes, I think so. I'll know by spring if I can afford the time.

THOMAS: Your school record is very good, and I like the fact that you've been active in sports and on the paper. We'll make our decision about your admission soon. You'll be hearing from us.

SMITH: I certainly do thank you, Dr. Thomas.

HALL: Thanks for coming in, Miss Smith. Mister Smith. Good-bye. (PAUSE WHILE SMITH LEAVES)

THOMAS: Marks, bring in the Smith file so we can enter our evaluation of the interview.

MARKS: I'm curious to know what you thought of the applicant.

HALL: Frankly, I'm pleased. The school record's good..and I was impressed. That was a good job of communication. There was evidence that Smith's kept a dialect--and I am all for that--you noticed that comment about "sprinting" being called "short run" in his black dialect. But since this was a fairly formal situation, I am glad that Smith chose to use formal English dialect during this interview.

MARKS: But I've heard you say that black people should be proud of their dialect.

HALL: Yes I have, and I'm proud of my own Appalachian dialect. I grew up way back in the hills. But I've learned when to use it and when not to use it.

MARKS: Excuse me, Dr. Hall, but isn't that being two-faced--not true to yourself?

THOMAS: I don't think so. We dress different ways for different occasions. Why shouldn't we adapt our speech just as we adapt our dress. I'm glad to see a person able to switch dialects when he wants to.

MARKS: Well, as long as you're not objecting to his keeping his dialect.

HALL: Not at all. People should keep ehtier heritage. But they can tone it up and down. Smith seems to me the kind of person we need. Put his file over there for last minute checking, and send in the next applicant.

N.C.C.U. UNC-CH

ROLE PLAYING SCRIPT #3
(revised)

#3SWOPE: Are you looking for the Vista Office?

#4JONES: Yes, I want to apply to work in a ghetto area. I'm Alice Jones.
Arvin Jones.

SWOPE: Your appointment is for ten o'clock. Dr. Phillips and Dr. Sams will be ready in a minute.

#1PHILIPS: (coming in from the other room) Go right into the conference room, on your right, and introduce yourself to Dr. Same. Where's the Jones file?

SWOPE: It's already in there on the table, Dr. Philips.

PHILIPS: Good--that's fine. Well now, you've had your physical, I see, and your papers are all in order.

#2SAME: The real purpose of this interview is to get some additional information. In Vista we work in rough areas with many different types of people and we have to communicate with all of them. Tell me, are you proud of being black?

JONES: (somowhat surprised) Well...yes. Yes I am.

PHILIPS: That's encouraging. Now I want to ask you about black speech. You're going to be working in ghetto areas.

SAME: Some people these days want to pretend that black dialect doesn't exist. I suppose that's because blacks have been told they spoke a dialect whereas whites spoke standard English. But that isn't true. Everyone in the world speaks some dialect, and many of us speak two or three. For example, I speak Southern white Piedmont dialect and, I hope, formal English dialect.

PHILIPS: Alice,
Arvin, can you still use your black dialect? I want you to answer the rest of my questions in Southern black Piedmont dialect. OK?

JONES: What's I got to lose?

SAME: How did you get interested in Vista?

JONES: I aKs my girl friend do she know how to find out 'bout Vista, 'cause I seed yo ads on Tee-Vee, an' Belinda, she say dat de office is on Fouf Street, so I got de papers an' all dat stuff you gives out, and here I is.

PHILIPS: Vista is hard work. Are you prepared to work hard?

whereas whites spoke standard English. [illegible] in the world speaks some dialect, and many of us speak two or three. For example, I speak Southern white Piedmont dialect and, I hope, formal English dialect.

PHILIPS: Alice, Arvin, can you still use your black dialect? I want you to answer the rest of my questions in Southern black Piedmont dialect. OK?

JONES: What's I got to lose?

SAME: How did you get interested in Vista?

JONES: I aKs my girl friend do she know how to find out 'bout Vista, 'cause I seed yo ads on Tee-Vee, an' Belinda, she say dat de office is on Fouf Street, so I got de papers an' all dat stuff you gives out, and here I is.

PHILIPS: Vista is hard work. Are you prepared to work hard?

JONES: Listen, baby, my name ain't Jone fer nutin'. My father, he work hard all his life. I start wurkin' in de dime store pushin' uh broom when I was fo'teen years old,ater school. Ain't nutin' I can't do if I wants to.

SAMS: Right on, Miss Jones, Mister Jones, right on! I see you can handle your dialect well. As we would say in my Appalachian dialect, "Hit hopes if'n our Vister workers kin speak both a formal English dialect and least ways one informal dialect."

PHILIPS: The whites we hire have to speak some white dialect--like Dr. Sams' white Appalachian dialect.

JONES: I'd like to learn Appalachian dialect too when I have the time.

PHILIPS: Sure. Well, thank you very much. You'll hear from us shortly.

JONES: Thanks again. Good-bye, Dr. Philips. So long, Dr. Sams. (JONES LEAVES)

SWOPE: Well, Dr. Philips, what did you and Dr. Sams think of Jones?

SAMS: The papers look good, and so are the recommendations. But what I liked best was the attitude.

PHILIPS: You mean Jones was--together? Well, I agree.

SWOPE: I could hear most of the interview. Jones certainly can handle both formal and informal English dialect. I liked that.

PHILIPS: And seemed proud of both of them. That's the kind we need. They can really communicate. Put the Jones file over there for last minute checking and let me know when the next person comes in.

N.C.C.U. UNC-CH

ROLE PLAYING SCRIPT #4
(revised)

#2SWOPE: Are you looking for the Vista Office?

#3JONES: Yes, I want to apply to work in a ghetto area. I'm Alice Jones.
Arvin Jones.

SWOPE: Your appointment is for ten o'clock. Dr. Philips and Dr. Sams will be ready in a minute.

#4PHILIPS: (coming in from the other room) Go right into the conference room, on your right, and introduce yourself to Dr. Sams. Where's the Jones file?

SWOPE: It's already in there on the table, Dr. Philips.

PHILIPS: Good--that's fine. Well now, you've had your physical, I see, and your papers are all in order.

#1SAMS: The real purpose of this interview is to get some additional information. In Vista we work in rough areas with many different types of people, and we have to communicate with all of them. Tell me, are you proud that you speak a dialect?

JONES: (somewhat surprised) Well...yes. Yes I am.

PHILIPS: That's encouraging. Now I want you to remember that you're going to be working in deprived areas where people speak informal English.

SAMS: Some people these days want to pretend that dialects don't exist. I suppose that's because some minorities have had their way of speaking referred to as a dialect, while the more prosperous people in the area were thought to speak standard English. But that isn't true. Everyone in the world speaks some dialect, and many of us speak two or three. For example, I speak Southern white Piedmont dialect and, I hope, formal English dialect.

PHILIPS: Alice,
Arvin, can you still use your dialect? I want you to answer the rest of my questions in your own dialect. OK?

JONES: I suppose so, but I prefer to speak good English. I fail to see what this has to do with the interview.

SAMS: How did you get interested in Vista?

JONES: I asked my friend if she knew about Vista, because I had heard your ads on television, and Belinda, my girl friend, she said that the office was on Fourth Street, so I got your papers and things, and here I am.

PHILIPS: Vista is hard work. Are you prepared to work hard?

JONES: Well, of course. I certainly am. My father has worked hard all his life. I began working in a department store cleaning up when I was fourteen years old, after school. I can do any amount of work I want to were thought to speak standard English. But that isn't true. Everyone in the world speaks some dialect, and many of us speak two or three. For example, I speak Southern white Piedmont dialect and, I hope, formal English dialect.

PHILIPS: Alice,
Arvin, can you still use your dialect? I want you to answer the rest of my questions in your own dialect. OK?

JONES: I suppose so, but I prefer to speak good English. I fail to see what this has to do with the interview.

SAMS: How did you get interested in Vista?

JONES: I asked my friend if she knew about Vista, because I had heard your ads on television, and Belinda, my girl friend, she said that the office was on Fourth Street, so I got your papers and things, and here I am.

PHILIPS: Vista is hard work. Are you prepared to work hard?

JONES: Well, of course. I certainly am. My father has worked hard all his life. I began working in a department store cleaning up when I was fourteen years old, after school. I can do any amount of work I want to.

SAMS: Well, I see you prefer to stick pretty close to formal English.

PHILIPS: Almost all the people we hire have to speak two or more dialects.

JONES: I suppose so, but I prefer always to speak as an educated person.

SAMS: Sure. Well, thank you very much. You'll hear from us shortly.

JONES: Thank you again. Good-bye, Dr. Philips. Good-bye, Dr. Sams. (JONES LEAVES)

SWOPE: Well, Dr. Philips, what did you and Dr. Sams think of Jones as a prospect?

SAMS: The papers look good, and so are the recommendations. But there was something about the attitude...

PHILIPS: You mean Jones was up tight about speaking a dialect. Well, I agree.

SWOPE: I could hear most of the interview. If Jones can speak a dialect, he
she
certainly didn't want to. But Jones' formal English is very good.

PHILIPS: And for some jobs that would be just great. But for Vista--could Jones make the people he
she
has to work with feel comfortable? Well, put the file over there and I'll put "questionable" on the interview rating. We may go back over the file later. And send in the next applicant.